DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 527 UD 007 124

By-Weinberg, Meyer
Desegregation Research: An Appraisal.
Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind. Commission on Education and Human Rights.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 68
Note-322p.
EDRS Price MF-$1.25 HC-$16.20
Descriptors-Academic Achievement, Aspiration, Black Community, Equal Education, Family Attitudes, *Integration Effects, *Integration Studies, Minority Groups, Race Relations, Racial Segregation, Racism, *Research Reviews (Publications), *School Integration, Self Concept, Student Experience
Identifiers-Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools

Examined and evaluated are studies which are relevant to the experience of children in desegregated schools. The chapters in the volume are concerned with desegregation and academic achievement, aspirations and self concept, the student in school and in his family, and non-Negro minorities. Also included is a chapter devoted to the "Equal Educational Opportunity Survey" and to "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools." Other sections are devoted to the Negro community and desegregation, and to the anti-desegregation critics. (NH)

ED031527

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DESEGREGATION RESEARCH: AN APPRAISAL

by

Meyer Weinberg
Chicago City College

A project of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission
on Education, Human Rights, and Responsibilities,
prepared with financial assistance from the
United States Office of Education

PHI DELTA KAPPA
Eighth and Union
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Summer, 1968

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

UD 007124

To

my mother

and the memory of

my father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the following for providing facilities and materials used in this study: The libraries of the University of Chicago; Harvard University; Chicago City College, Wright Campus; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights; and the Equal Educational Opportunity Program, U. S. Office of Education. Microfilm copies of unpublished dissertations were obtained from University Microfilms and the microphotography services of various universities. A number of researchers kindly supplied copies of their unpublished studies.

Special thanks are due two persons: David S. Seeley immediately saw the need for such a study and facilitated its sponsorship by the U. S. Office of Education. Professor James Bash of the University of Virginia aided significantly by a close critical reading and with suggestions for improvement.

Mrs. Cecilia Bethe typed the manuscript with care and dispatch.

— Meyer Weinberg

CONTENTS

Foreword ix

Chapter | Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Desegregation and Academic Achievement 9

III. Aspirations and Self-Concept 64

IV. The Student in School and in the Family 112

V. Non-Negro Minorities 160

VI. Two Federal Reports 185

VII. The Negro Community and Desegregation 216

VIII. Anti-Desegregation Critics 248

IX. Conclusions 277

Bibliography 282

Author Index 309

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		Page
1	Estimated Components of Average Educational Disadvantage: Baltimore City Negro Students	42
2	Weighted Parameters of Main Effects on Ninth Grade Negro Student Verbal Achievement, Under Different Control Conditions	45
3	Ethnic Identification and Defensive Insulation	99
4	Desegregators' Changing Perceptions of Their Intellectual Abilities Compared to White Peers (by percent)	129
5	Self Report of Change in Grades During Two School Years in Desegregator and Control Population	130
6	Teachers' Race and Student Perceptions	131
7	Teachers' Race and Reasons for Job Dissatisfaction	132
8	Percent Agreeing With Statement, By Integration of Elementary and High School, Northern-Born Students	217
9	Percent Highly Prejudiced, Among White Persons Who Did and Did Not Attend School With Negroes, By Educational Status of Respondent and Spouse	219
10	Negro Views on Pace of School Desegregation in Detroit Area	223
11	Advantages and Disadvantages of Going to a White School, According to Negro Parents in Montgomery, Alabama	225
12	The Use of Busing and Creation of Metropolitan School District to Enhance District Integration (in percentage)	226

13 Civil Rights Index 228

14 Negroes' Evaluation of Rights Most Important To Be Worked For Now (Percent Choosing Item as Most Important) 266

FOREWORD

Few persons would deny that there has been more discussion of school desegregation than of any other issue at every level of American life — within the family, the neighborhood, and within local, state and national governmental agencies. Until only a few years ago the protagonists and the antagonists had little basic research upon which to base their arguments for or against desegregation; the primary sources of support appeared to be the same for either group, i.e., legal, moral or philosophical. But during the period, 1958-68, while the public and private debates were being held throughout the country, a number of researchers designed experimental studies to test the myriads of hypotheses attendant to school desegregation (e.g. mixing white and Negro children in school will result in a lowering of academic standards, white children will not receive as good an education as in the past, Negro children will become more hostile to whites because of frustration over not being able to compete successfully in the desegregated classroom, or higher achievement by all students can be expected in desegregated schools, etc.). Such research efforts continue to increase in number and quality, and they are providing the foundation upon which justifiable educational postures can be constructed.

The contribution of the author, through this report of an assessment of the research on desegregation conducted to date, is unquestionably a "benchmark" in the field. The evaluation of research on desegregation reported herein will be useful to educational researchers, to students of the process of change, to school officials as they reorganize curricula for instructional purposes, and to those persons who plan pre-service and in-service preparation programs for teachers.

The evaluation of the research represents the work and the interpretations of the author, and does not necessarily represent the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Education, Human Rights, and Responsibilities or that of the fraternity in general; however, the Commission is pleased to have been associated with Mr. Weinberg in the production of this important book. This book was prepared under the sponsorship of the Commission on Education, Human Rights, and Responsibilities of Phi Delta Kappa and was supported by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, which, however, assumes no responsibility for the content.

— James H. Bash
For the Commission

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATION, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(1968 - 69)

Paul I. Clifford, Chairman
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

James H. Bash
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

William L. Cobb
San Francisco Unified
School District
San Francisco, California 94102

Charles R. Foster
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Carlos Rivera
El Paso Public Schools
El Paso, Texas 79999

Glenn R. Snider
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Herbert W. Wey
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

William G. Zimmerman, Jr.
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts 03755

Gayle B. Childs
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Donald W. Robinson
PHI DELTA KAPPAN
Eighth and Union Streets
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"It is not enough to believe in equality," writes De Vos, "we must see what science can say further about it."[1] The present work is an attempt to see what "science says" about the educational consequences of school desegregation.

Two decades ago, the present work could not have been written; there just wasn't that much desegregation to study. Since then, social practice has overtaken the scholars. Today, sufficient desegregation has occurred so that scholars have a surfeit of experience to study. Unfortunately, however, the scholars now lag behind the reality. In 1966, a Federal official in charge of desegregation enforcement activities replied to a congressional inquiry as to the existence of research on desegregation: "The basic problem is there are very few researchers that want to work on it for some reason, but it is a very real problem."[2]

Nevertheless, considerable research has been done. Much of it remains unpublished or is circulated only within narrow circles of experts. The present volume is the first book-length review of the field; a number of excellent reviews of research have appeared that encompass parts of the field or shorter periods.

A clarification of key terms would seem to be in order. These are: segregation, desegregation, integration, and deprivation.

For purposes of this study the term segregation is defined as a socially-patterned separation of people, with or without explicit sanction. The legal distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* segregation has not been found to be of any consequence in studying the impact of segregation upon children. The essential mark of a segregated school is not the pressure of a certain ethnic mixture although a number of practical measures of the mixture have been offered by students of the problem. Fundamentally, a school is segregated when the community comes to view the school in its nature to be inferior and unsuitable for privileged children. For example, a school is segregated whenever it becomes known as a "Negro school." The stigma imposed upon the school by the community makes it segregated; virtually always, a stigmatized school will be deprived of an equal share of community resources inasmuch as the control of the resources, too, is socially-patterned.

If a school is considered by the community to be adequate for minority children but not for majority children, that school is segregated. A pragmatic test of this distinction is easily applied to what is often called "reverse busing," i.e., the busing of white children to a predominantly Negro school. White parents most frequently -- and at times with justification -- object that the transfer would result in their children being placed in a poor school with a negative effect on their learning. The significant point is not the accuracy of the white complaint but the tacit assumption by whites that the same contention does not apply to the Negro children.

The term desegregation is defined as the abolition of social practices that bar equal access to opportunity or that bar equal access to the "mainstream of American life." The effort is to create new patterns of interaction by altering the organizational and administrative structures that contribute to segregation. Desegregation is thus a matter than can be effectuated through administrative measures. It needs only to be decided, and it can be done; its success does not require certain qualitative types of children or teachers or administrators.

The significance of desegregation is missed, however, if we characterize it as "moving bodies." To be sure the attendance of Negro and white children in a common school is the most obvious feature of desegregation. It is psychological naivete to imagine that such attendance in a race-conscious society is without consequence for the students involved. The research results reported in the present work suggest that the consequences are pervasive, profound, and complex.

The term integration is defined as the realization of equal opportunity by deliberate cooperation and without regard to racial or other social barriers. The concept of integration stresses realization of equal opportunity: "Education which is equally bad for everyone is not integrated education; it simply skimps educational opportunity in like manner for all. Thus, integrated education of low quality is a contradiction in terms."[1]

In an integrated school, individual differences would bear no stigma as it became clear that these were not social differences in disguise.

Students, teachers, and administrators would cease making invidious comparisons as differences ceased being stigmatic. Acceptance, mutual respect, and cooperation are the tempers of an integrated school.

The term deprivation is defined as the socially-patterned withholding of educational opportunity from selected groups of persons. Reference is to a group pattern and not to isolated deprived persons. The concept of deprivation implies withheld advantage and this would seem to be more adequately conceived as a group phenomenon. Deprivation and privilege are opposites, even though the privilege be merely the right to attend a white school that is only slightly less inferior than the Negro school. Segregation has, of course, often been used to allocate opportunities among the deprived as well as the privileged; indeed, it is a question whether it has ever been used for anything else. Problems of deprivation are compounded by consideration of race and class. All the deprived, more or less, are also segregated. But for Negroes, race is an additional depressive factor.

In the present work are examined studies which shed light on the experience of children in desegregated schools. Ideally, such a study would compare the achievement or other characteristics of individual children both "before and after" desegregation. Forces that impinge on desegregation -- such as social class or region or residence -- could be controlled while racial composition of the school or the classroom were varied. Unfortunately, attempting to separate the influence of social class from race is sometimes as difficult as separating the red from the white in pink.

Only a few researchers have distinguished between a desegregated and a transitional school. The latter type is an all-white school in the process of becoming a predominantly Negro school; whereas a desegregated school is characterized by a stable interracial student body. Obviously, the setting in the transitional school is highly unfavorable to constructive and productive student relations. Confusion of the two types of interracial schools is not uncommon.

Negro children usually appear in the desegregation process as passive partners in learning. They are the ones who are transferred or bused. They are the ones who, if at all, receive special services in the new school. Yet, the passivity is only apparent. Under conditions of change, their self-awareness is aroused. How does the Negro child add up these experiences? What happens to have self-conception? Is he overwhelmed by new challenges and driven to self-depreciation? These are some of the leading issues of desegregation research reviewed here.

Another set of problems revolves around the topic of academic achievement by chilren of sharply differing socioeconomic levels. Much of the recorded desegregation has not been of the type that would draw together such students. In many cases, the socioeconomic status of Negro and white is similar. It is perhaps of more interest, however, to observe contrasting cases. A related problem is the impact of busing on achievement. Inasmuch as busing of physically handicapped or of geographically isolated children has not been known to affect achievement, it is of interest to see if the same holds for interracial busing. A final problem of interest is the impact of ability grouping or academic tracing on achievement. As we will see, this is a topic well worth the study.

How do Negro and white students get on as schoolmates? In class sessions, in extra-curricular activities, in informal socializing, the racial factor is at work. The real question is whether and to what extent desegregation has overcome it. Can desegregation look forward to more than civility between children of different ethnic groups? Teachers are another dimension of the desegregation situation. To what extent have they played a leadership role, following or lagging behind dominant community opinion?

Desegregation concerns ethnic minorities other than Negroes. A sampling of studies of Mexican-American and Indian-American children in desegregation situations are examined. In some ways, the burdens of being a minority child in a white-centered culture are common to these children and to Negro children. Poverty and powerlessness are poor preparation for equal-status contact. On the other hand, cultural differences distinguish the minority children. Indian Americans are not, that is, Red Negroes.

It is curious how little reaches the pages of formal studies of the daily life and attitudes in Negro-American communities. Numerous studies are made of white attitudes toward Negroes, of reactions of whites to the prospect of school desegregation, or of strategies for changing white attitudes. Negro life is thus viewed as a resultant of other forces rather than an autonomous factor in its own. In Chapter 7 are brought together the findings of a number of studies that may help the reader bring a certain coherence to the subject.

While an entire chapter is devoted to an examination of the factual basis of the anti-desegregation position, two topics are not discussed: (1) whether Negroes have an inferior intelligence by birth, and (2) whether the U. S. Supreme Court had an adequate scientific basis for the Brown decision in 1954. Endless controversy surrounds both points. The present writer has never seen evidence that convinces him of the inborn inferiority of any race of people; full-lenth explorations of the quesion can be found elsewhere. Both quesions -- "inferior" intelligence and the 1954 ruling -- are quite irrelevant to the present concern. In this work the central question is: Desegregation occurred; what were the results?

Veblen once wrote: "So it is something of a homiletical commonplace to say that the outcome of any serious research can only be to make two questions grow where one question grew before."[1] And so in the present case, as well. Research into desegregation has gone far beyond the simplicities of single queries and replies. It is, however, a matter of some personal gratification to note that the proliferous progress of research supports confidence in the creative potentials of our fellow men.

FOOTNOTES

Page 1

1. George De Vos in Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight (eds.), Caste and Race: Comparative Approaches (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), p. 289.

2. David S. Seeley in U. S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights, Guidelines for School Desegregation Hearings (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 139.

Page 3

1. Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965), p. 29. See, also, James S. Coleman, The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity, unpublished paper read at a conference of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967.

Page 7

1. Thorstein Veblen, "The Evolution of the Scientific Point of View," in The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays (N. Y.: Viking, 1942), p. 33.

CHAPTER II

DESEGREGATION AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

How has racial desegregation affected academic achievement? To answer this question, a number of empirical inquiries into actual classroom desegregation are reviewed and presented in this chapter.[1] The findings of each study are reported and, if it is an extensive study, an assessment is made of its procedure and method. From time to time indications are made of the interrelations of two or more studies. Special attention is paid the emergence of certain central questions in the history of desegregation research.

What is a study? Any scholarly attempt to discover the truth about a subject. In this connection, scholarship means careful and disciplined inquiry rather than formal behavior said to be peculiar to universities. Accordingly, this chapter deals with a very broad range of studies, many of them academic in origin, but some not.

First, a group of studies is considered which report on academic achievement under racially segregated conditions. Second, several studies are examined in which the situations are bi-racial but which exhibit no special concern for stimulating desegregation. Third, the heart of the chapter, a group of more or less controlled studies of

desegregated situations are presented. This section represents the most extensive examination of its kind. Fourth, a few studies of busing are analyzed. And fifth, some summary statements are made about the research value of various formal program evaluations that were conducted in New York City.

I. Learning Under Segregated Conditions

Around the time of the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision, numerous school systems started to publish achievement test scores of Negro and white students. Without exception, the results showed a very large gap between the two. These discrepancies, it should be recalled, existed after more than a half century of a theoretical "separate-but-equal" national school policy.

During 1953-1954, the Texas Association of School Administrators surveyed achievement of eighty percent of that state's school children. "In most cases," it was reported, "the achievement of white pupils as measured by standard test scores was very satisfactory; most Negro pupils were performing unsatisfactorily when judgments were made on the basis of tests."[1] In 1950, a survey in Dade County, Florida, of arithmetic achievement by eighth graders found white children ahead of national norms while Negro children lagged by two years.[2] Negro sixth graders in Nashville were more than two years behind white students in overall achievement.[3]

In the North, the situation was far from satisfactory. During 1954, for example, Ferguson and Plaut surveyed the senior classes of thirty-two public high schools in eleven northern states. Out of a total of 10,388 seniors, about a third -- 3,337 -- were Negroes. Only 24 of these 3,337 were in the upper quarter of their class and could offer the necessary minimum number of college admission units.[1] In New York City, during November, 1959, half of all seventh-grade pupils were reading more than two years below level;[2] a majority of these children were Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Four years later, over eighty percent of sixth graders in Central Harlem schools were reading below level.[3] Landers has reported that in 1966 "the typical Central Harlem student in grade 5 was retarded one year and one month."[4]

In 1960, Kennedy and his associates surveyed a large sample of Negro children in the southeastern states. They found the mean IQ to be 80.7, as contrasted with a "normal" score of 100.[5] Further, the older the group, the lower the IQ. Five year-olds had a mean IQ of 86 while thirteen year-olds averaged only 65. Achievement as measured by standardized group tests was found to follow this pattern of progressive relative decline. A restudy, five years later, found the pattern to be undisturbed. IQ trends remained as they had been and achievement declines continued so that "the amount of retardation at the tenth-grade level is quite severe."[6]

Evidence is contradictory as to the universality among Negro youth of progressive relative declines in IQ.

In Central Harlem during 1964, median I Q scores declined somewhat as follows:[7]

Grade	Median I Q
3	90.6
6	86.3
8	87.7

A year earlier, Schreiber characterized "the average Harlem child": "In grade 3, his I Q score is a little below 100; in grade 6, it is in the low 90's; in grade 8, it is in the low 80's."[1]

Two studies fail to support the thesis of progressive relative decline.

Harris and Lovinger followed the record of I Q scores for 80 Negro students in New York City. The difference between the first-grade and the ninth-grade means of the same children (97.6 and 96.0) was not statistically significant.[2] Scott studies the I Q record of 65 Negro students in Chicago and found that mean I Q had fallen between first and ninth grades from 93.06 to 89.92.[3] While statistically significant (at the five percent level), this difference is very small indeed; in addition, two different I Q tests were used between grades and one cannot therefore make too much of this relatively small change. The Harris and Lovinger and the Scott studies are truly longitudinal, i.e., the subjects are the same ones during the periods of comparison. On the other hand, the studies that argue for the universality of progressive relative decline are cross-sectional, i.e., the subjects are different ones along the continuum and so changes in any of them are not, in fact, recorded. Sometimes this distinction is difficult to discover. Deutsch and Brown, for example, assert about their sample, that "within the Negro lower-class, there is a consistent decrement in I Q level from the first to fifth grade."[4] It would seem that they are not speaking of the same children over a period of five years.

While the career of I Q scores may be indeterminate, this is far from the case when it comes to the matter of academic achievement. There is an almost universally acknowledged drop in academic achievement among Negro school children as they "progress" in school. Whether the research procedure is longitudinal or cross-sectional, the result is the same. Harris and Lovinger found that their subjects -- who had not lost in I Q scores -- nevertheless lagged one and a half years behind the achievement norm for seventh grade.

Long found the same to be true in a study of Washington, D.C. Negro third graders.[1] "The signs indicate," according to Long, "that there is a tendency in our groups for scores in intelligence and achievement to vary inversely .... One must consider the possibility of accounting for the difference in terms of environment or miseducation."[2]

In the main, the low I Q and achievement scores of Negro children just reviewed have occurred in a context of segregation. Does attendance at racially mixed schools bring about any changes in I Q and achievement? The remainder of this chapter deals with this question. In the next part we examine studies and/or reports of bi-racial school situations which are reviewed for their unplanned effect, if any, on Negro learning. In the third part, we analyze the findings of controlled research studies of desegregation and the effects upon learning.

II. Learning in Bi-Racial School Situations

In 1913, Mayo made a study of the school grades of Negro and white students in two New York City high schools. While he found no very great differences between the two groups, nevertheless he reported: "Relative retardation ... would seem to be characteristic of the high school colored group .... The colored pupils are about three-quarters as efficient as the whites in the pursuit of high school studies."[1] Yet, white students were more likely to become dropouts.[2]

Witty and Decker studied Negro and white achievement in the schools of Coffeyville, Kansas.[3] The sample included 1,725 white and 220 Negro students. The latter scored consistently lower on a batter of achievement tests. The smallest gap, however, was on a test of history and literature. The researchers remarked: "The success of the children upon this test suggests that the Negroes studied must be functioning far below capacity in many school subjects."[4]

Crowley compared Negro achievement in segregated and non-segregated schools in Cincinnati.[5] Two groups of 55 Negro children were selected from two segregated and four non-segregated schools. The groups were equated as to grades, age, mental age, and I Q scores. Students were not specifically matched by socioeconomic measures although Crowley stated that "the school records and social histories indicated that the groups were equated in respect to ... social status .... "[6] A battery of standard achievement tests was administered. Students in the non-segregated schools scored significantly higher in writing and spelling. In the remaining tests, no significant differences were found.

A study of the Portland, Oregon high schools divided Negro and non-Negro students according to grades and the racial and social composition of the elementary schools they had attended. Seniors who had earned a grade-point average of "C" or higher were classified as follows:[1]

Students	Racial and social composition of elementary school				
	25 percent or more Negro	5-24% Negro	Lower-income white	Middle-income white	High-income white
Negro	32%	38%	8%	33%	0
Non-Negro	70%	69%	70%	76%	85%

The study concluded that Negro achievement was benefited by attendance at schools with relatively more whites and middle-class students. This conclusion seems best supported with respect to the learning benefits of attendance at middle-class rather than lower-class white schools. The difference between schools of varying racial percentages does not seem to be of unquestioned significance. Finally, the study is based on classroom grades rather than objective test scores and is for that reason alone to be treated cautiously.

Clark and Plotkin studied the academic record of 519 Negro students who had been helped financially through integrated colleges by the National Scholarship Service and the Fund for Negro Students. These 519 students had attended college during 1952 and 1956. Their college aptitude, as measured by SAT, was below the average of the national college population; yet, significantly more of them completed college with at least average grades than did the general college population.[2] Clark and Plotkin stress that "the academic performance of these students is far beyond the level that would be indicated by such predictive devices as college board scores, family income, and educational background."[3]

Negro students from southern high schools earned higher college grades than did graduates of northern high schools. The researchers suggest four alternative explanations without supporting or rejecting any: (1) northern high schools are inferior, (2) southern students are more highly motivated, (3) some kind of intellectual selectivity among southern high school students, or (4) a combination of these factors. Whatever the reason, however, these students are undoubted examples of Negroes who were able to function satisfactorily under the same intellectual standards as white youth. Nor did educational success leave them without racial identification. Still, they were a highly select group.

Bindman studied a considerably less select group. These were 154 males of the 326 Negro students on the main campus (Urbana) of the University of Illinois.[1] Nearly half the larger total was composed of graduates of Chicago high schools. As in the case of the Clark-Plotkin sample, the University of Illinois Negro students were performing academically at a higher level than could have been predicted by precollege test scores. Unlike the Clark-Plotkin sample, however, these students were twice as likely as white students to be marginal performers.[2] Only about one-sixth of the 154 Negro students were able to earn a "C+" average and thus remain in good standing in most university curricula.[3]

Student performance at the university seemed unrelated either to socio-economic background or to having attended a predominantly

Negro high school. Bindman discovered that Negro students from more advantaged homes were not better prepared.[1] Some seventy percent of the students fell below the fiftieth percentile of all students enrolled in their department. To Bindman, this indicated that "students from both 'integrated' and predominantly Negro high schools came inadequately prepared for college."[2] At no level of academic performance were the records of Negro students distinguishable from one another on the criterion of having attended segregated or presumably non-segregated schools.[3]

The dynamics of poor Negro scholastic performance were described by Bindman as essentially a social-psychological process of on-campus alienation. This phenomenon is examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

Johnson and his colleagues studied the academic adequacy of Chicago high schools from which University of Illinois Negro and white students graduated. They compared grade-point averages earned at the university (at the Chicago Circle campus) with the racial composition of the high school. Here is a summary of this finding:[4]

Race of Students	Grade Point Average of Students Graduating From:	
	Predominantly white high school	Predominantly Negro high school
Negro	2.78	2.45
White	3.40	2.75

Thus, those Negro and white students performed better who had come from a perdominantly white high school. (It should be kept in mind that the basic data in this study are grade-point averages which do not bear great weight when drawing fine distinctions between groups of students.)

The Bindman and Johnson studies are consistent in that Negro students were shown to be distinctly unprepared to function adequately at the university. In fact, Johnson's data permit the observation that the white students were only somewhat less unprepared. White students from white high schools averaged a little less than a "middle-C" while the Negro students from such schools earned a "D+" average.

Johnson also found that the Negroes and whites who earned the highest grade-point averages had graduated from a single integrated high school. This finding was not inconsistent with his main findings. An unspecified number of Negro and white high-scorers, however, were found to come from a single predominantly Negro school. From this finding, Johnson and his associates leapt to the conclusion that "predominantly Negro schools seem to be able to provide a quality education."[1]

Such a conclusion seems unwarranted, for several reasons. This exceptional Negro school is listed as being attended by middle-class students; the relative success, if it can be documented, thus reflects a class rather than a racial difference. Also, exceedingly few students are involved in these calculations; these are most highly selected students from a great mass of poorly-educated children. The fact that a handful succeeds is not exceptional; and it has no beneficial impact on those who fail. Following is a compilation, not presented by Johnson:[1]

Predicted and Actual Grades at the University of Illinois of Graduates of 12 Chicago High Schools, by Race
September, 1963 - February, 1965

Origin of Students	Predicted grade-pt. average	Actual grade-pt. average	Percentile ranking in high school graduating class	Number of Students	Percent Negro
Six top-ranked high schools	3.44	3.33	69	753	1
Six lowest-ranked high schools	2.10	2.45	90	99	96

The racial differential in scholastic performance is overwhelming.

During 1959-1960, the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights sponsored two conferences on desegregation.[2] Superintendents attended from school systems in eighteen states and the District of Columbia. Eleven of them spoke to the question of whether desegregation had lowered academic standards in their systems. Nine said no and two yes. All noted the initial lag of Negro students but most observed that special measures had invariably led to improvement. In 1958, seventy school systems in various stages of desegregation were studied.[3] Two thirds the number of schools were re-studied in 1963.[4] Wey reports: "In 1958 many teachers and principals felt that desegregation had necessitated a lowering of some academic standards. ... In 1963 only two out of forty respondents felt that the instructional program had been handicapped by the placement of Negroes in formerly all-white schools. Administrators and teachers stated over and over that they had a better institutional program now than they had before desegregation began.[1]

In Washington, D.C., after five years of desegregation, Negro students "performed somewhat better" than during the five years preceding desegregation; at the same time, white students performed "at least as well" as under segregation.[2] Morland compared the reading and arithmetic median scores of two ninth-grade classes in Austin, Texas.[3] Following desegregation, these scores remained essentially unchanged. A study of Evansville, Indiana, concluded that the academic level of the school had not been "noticeably lowered" by desegregation.[4]

Between 1957 and 1962, a minimal junior college program to deal mainly with academic shortcomings of Negro students succeeded in increasing the percentage who graduated from two to seven.[5] In 1963, a sample of Chicago sixth-grade students took the "Word Knowledge" section of the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Following is a table of the median stanine of sixth-grade achievement test scores by race and socioeconomic status of the school:[6]

Race, Class, and Achievement
In Chicago Schools, 1963

Neighborhood	White School	Integrated School	Negro School
High education status	6.0	5.0	5.0
Median education status	5.5	4.5	4.0
Low education status	5.0	4.0	3.0

The New York City Demonstration Guidance Project exemplifies a project which was interracial but whose ethnicity was not the focal point of attention.[1] Selected students in a predominantly Puerto Rican-Negro junior high school were given extensive services and various special aids. Over a period of 38 months, the median I Q score for 105 students rose 9.3 points on the Pintner Test of General Ability. Compared with pre-project youngsters, nearly four times as many of those who went on to finish high school -- itself a large number -- also entered college. The project, it should be noted, involved the movement of children from an ethnically segregated elementary school to an integrated high school.[2]

III. Controlled Studies of the Effects of Desegregation

Two studies have been made of desegregation in Oakland, California, by Elliott and Badal and by the Dumbarton Research Council.[3]

Elliott and Badal tried to answer this question: "Does racial composition of the school make a difference in achievement when scholastic aptitude is controlled?" Their subjects were 4,693 fifth graders in October, 1962. Schools were classified by percent Negro: 80 percent and over, 46 to 79 percent, 11 to 45 percent, and 10 percent and less. Every child took an aptitude test (SCAT) and three achievement tests (STEP). Mathematics achievement scores rose as the percent Negro enrolled fell. For the two -- out of six -- highest ability levels of children, the same held true for writing-achievement scores; for the lower ability levels, no significant differences were found. Reading achievement scores seemed altogether unaffected by racial composition of school. All in all, concluded Elliott and Badal, racial composition makes no important difference for achievement when scholastic aptitude is controlled. Thus, by implication, the importance of racial desegregation was denied.

As the researchers themselves note, their study does not concern changes brought about in individual children as much as in school atmospheres. Without relating achievement atmospheres to classroom behavior of specific children, it is difficult to see what value resides in such a study. It is as difficult to explain the main outcomes as the exceptions. Specifically lacking is a basis for assessing the impact of racially-mixed schools upon the learning of specific children. In this real sense, the Elliott and Badal study is not a test of desegregation.

The Dumbarton study undertook to discover "whether significant differences would be observed between those Negroes whose elementary school experience had been in segregated or predominantly Negro schools and those whose experience had been in racially balanced schools; and, similarly, between white children who had attended only all-white elementary schools, or only racially balanced schools."[1] Some forty percent of Oakland's public high school graduates had attended the city schools continuously since entering first grade in 1953. After omission of a number of these (Orientals, Spanish surname, and others), a sample of 400 remained. A great number were interviewed.

Summary achievement results are stated by the Dumbarton researchers: "White children perform better than Negro; Negroes in racially mixed schools better than Negroes in segregated schools."[1] A social gulf exists between Negro and white children. Can the greater academic achievement of Negroes in mixed schools be attributed to social class differences ? The researchers point out that all Negro children in the study were highly comparable with regard to parents' incomes, occupations, and educational achievement levels. These, of course, are the variables customarily equated with socioeconomic background. It would appear, then, that achievement differences between both groups of Negro children are to be attributed to the beneficial effect of interracial schooling. But the Dumbarton researchers fail to make such a claim.

Instead, they point to a series of narrower social factors which, *en toto*, might well account for the achievement differences among the Negro students. Family factors predominate. Families of Negro children attending racially mixed schools show the following differences with children attending Negro schools:[2]

> . . . Smaller families and greater family stability -- a significantly higher proportion . . . lived during their childhood with both natural parents; home ownership; a visiting pattern which must mean more friendships between parents and children of both races. The mother of the child in the desegregated school was much more likely to be working and less likely to be on welfare, and therefore less alienated from and hostile toward the white world.

White children, on the other hand, were found to achieve more in white-segregated than in mixed schools. This difference, however, was clearly a result of social class rather than color. Whites in all-white schools were of a much higher social status that whites in mixed schools.

Unfortunately, the Dumbarton study is available only in draft from. A full statistical analysis of test scores is still to be made. Unlike the Elliott-Badal study, the present research is truly longitudinal. It finds academic achievement to be benefited by desegregation. But it tends to resolve the desegregation effect into various social class constituents. No effort is made to separate out the precise relative contributions of racial desegregation and socioeconomic status to achievement. Also, neither study attempts to discover whether the race-achievement tie is more salient for classrooms than for schools. It follows, too, that neither study undertook an analysis of ability grouping to find whether the location of children reflects deliberate administrative decisions or inherent relationships of achievement and ethnicity.

Stallings studied academic achievement both before and after desegregation in Louisville. After one year, Negro achievement scores rose more than those of whites.[1] Stallings, it should be observed, did not contrast differential achievement in segregated and desegregated schools. Instead, he grouped all students of each race and compared the two races. This procedure obscures the precise connections between desegregation and improved achievement.[1] Katz observed that academic achievement improvement occurred in segregated as well as desegregated schools. Accordingly, such improved learning should be "attributed to factors other than desegregation, such as a general improvement in educational standards."[2] Nevertheless, Pettigrew points to the constructive motivational effects of desegregation in raising the sights of Negro children even when their schools continue to be segregated.[3]

Between 1958 and 1967, fourteen studies of learning under desegregation were made. For the most part dealing with an experiment in a single school system, they must be adjudged more or less rigorous. Following is a discussion of these studies.

Samuels conducted a study in New Albany, Indiana, which sought to discover whether school learning proceeded at comparable rates for Negro and white children when children were first desegregated in junior high school and when Negro students in desegregated schools were compared with those in segregated schools.[4] In both cases, Samuels attempted to control variables such as socioeconomic status and intelligence. For nearly all the students involved, the junior high years were their first experience with desegregation.

In the first comparison, Negro and white students were matched, and their academic achievement over two years compared with the use of achievement test results and classroom grades. In the second comparison, two groups of Negro students were the subjects: one, consisted of children who had attended mixed elementary schools; the other, children who had attended a segregated school. All comparisons involved matched groups.

Samuels found that after two years of desegregation, the achievement gap between Negro and white had narrowed significantly. The researcher attributed this improvement directly to desegregation. He found, too, that the Negro children who attended interracial elementary schools started out in first grade achieving at the same level as Negro children did in the segregated school. By third grade, however, the desegregated Negro children had pulled ahead; this continued into sixth grade. Overall, Samuels observed that "the longer the association between any particular group of white and Negro students the smaller the differences in academic achievement appear to be ... and that the Negro students who had been educated in mixed schools achieved as well as and sometimes better than white students in the integrated program."[1]

Fortenberry studied Negro achievement in Oklahoma City under conditions of segregation and desegregation.[2] Achievement scores of a sample of 8th and 9th grade Negro students were compared with their 6th grade scores. Some of the children had never attended a desegregated school, and others had attended segregated schools through the sixth grade but a desegregated school in the 7th and 8th grades. All subjects had had statistically similar achievement test scores in 6th grade.

Findings showed that by 8th grade, students in mixed classes had gained more in arithmetic while neither group had gained relatively more in reading. By ninth grade, children in mixed classes scored higher in arithmetic and language while the children in non-mixed classes scored higher in reading. All differences were statistically significant. Fortenberry's overall conclusion was that "in general, Negroes achieve better in mixed than in non-mixed classes."[1]

Spruill's study did not deal directly with our topic, but a side remark of his is of some interest. His study involved twenty-nine teachers in Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia. After desegregation, he noted, it often became clear that "white students entering predominantly Negro schools are slower learners than the average white child which may eventually cause Negro parents to lose respect for their school because they will say it is a dumping group for slow learners... ."[2] If this is generally true, it would seem necessary to guard doubly against the pitfalls of comparing newly desegregated Negro children with white children of a suddenly lower socioeconomic position. The specific pitfall is to attend too much to the racial component of desegregation without observing simultaneous changes in the social class situation.

Katzenmeyer studied the effect of social interaction on achievement of Negro and white pupils in the public schools of Jackson, Michigan.[3] He hypothesized that "the measured intelligence of the group of Negro children will be significantly changed as the consequence of school experience which enhances their opportunities for social interaction with the dominant white culture."[4]

All children entering kindergarten in October and November, 1957 and 1958 were given a standard intelligence test. Included were 193

Negroes and 1,061 whites. All were retested in second grade during October, 1959 and 1960. Treating the Negroes as an experimental group and the whites as a control, the mean I Q scores were as follows:[1]

	1957 - 1958	1959 - 1960
Experimental group	83.06	89.74
Control group	102.04	103.91

The change in means of the experimental group was found to be statistically significant beyond the .001 level. Katzenmeyer concluded that the change was to be explained principally by the social interaction between Negro and white children. In Jackson, he noted, "the great majority of the Negro population is confined to a small area of the city by economic limitations and by discriminatory policies and pressures in the sale of real estate . . . . Thus, for most Negro children, entry into the racially mixed public school program represents the beginning of a period of increased social contact."[2] Another part of the explanation, according to Katzenmeyer, is the high per student expenditure in Jackson schools. Presumably, the Negro child, more deprived to begin with, benefited more from the challenge of a more adequate educational program.

As a matter of fact, Katzenmeyer claimed less for his study than his data permit. An examination of his statistical findings reveals that 184 of the total Negro sample of 193 were enrolled in six of the city's sixteen elementary schools. In these six schools, Negro children constituted 34.1 percent of total enrollment. The remaining nine Negro students of the sample attended five other schools. Five more schools were all-white. Rearranging and recalculating data on changes in test mean scores, we get the following:[1]

Gain in Points on Mean Test Scores

	Experimental	Control
6 schools with 184 Negro children	6.54	0.50
5 schools with 9 Negro children	8.93	1.14
5 schools with no Negro children	--	2.76

For all practical purposes, the bottom ten schools can be dropped. If so, then the difference in test means between experimental (Negro) and control (white) is larger than Katzenmeyer reported. Instead of 6.68 vs. 1.87, it becomes 6.54 vs. 0.50. No socioeconomic data are available, but initial mean I Q scores for the three control sub-groups were, in the above order, 98.81, 102.84, and 102.57; for the two experimental sub-groups, they were 82.77 and 88.53.[2]

Katzenmeyer concluded: "While the implications of this study point to some of the disadvantages of segregated schools, they suggest that the answer to the equalization of educational opportunity lies only partially in 'integration' per se; they suggest that a problem basic to the school lies in guiding and encouraging the assimilative process."[3] Two observations remain to be noted about Katzenmeyer's procedure. First, the experimental group might have been matched with a control group of Negro children. And it would have been instructive to know the color composition of each classroom within the six schools. In this way, the significance of social interaction could have been tested more directly.

Lesser and his associates conducted a study in New York City of academic achievement under varying conditions of racial balance and imbalance; minority children in the study included Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, and Jews.[1] Some 400 children were tested for verbal ability, reasoning, numerical ability, and space conceptualization. "For every one of the four abilities measured," according to Lesser, "the children from the more integrated schools and neighborhoods showed significantly superior performance when compared to the children from racially-imbalanced schools and neighborhoods."[2] A "convergence-effect" was observed: "In the more racially-balanced schools, the children from the various ethnic groups show quite similar scores -- displaying levels of ability more similar to each other. In contrast, in the racially-imbalanced schools, average test scores for each ethnic group remain markedly different.[3] Lesser held that factors other than racial composition -- social class, for example -- helped explain the results but that the racial factor was basic. Unfortunately, no supporting data were presented in the article and so it is not possible to assess this research.

Gunthorpe studied Negro-white academic differentials in Copiague, Long Island.[4] All the town's three elementary and single junior high schools are almost perfectly racially-balanced. Negroes make up about twenty-one percent of the population of the school district; another forty percent is of Italian descent. In the junior high school, students are assigned to one of three tracks, with track A being the highest one.

Here is the racial composition of the tracks, by percentage:[1]

	Track A	Track B	Track C
Negroes	10.0	22.6	33.3
Whites	90.0	77.4	66.6

Curiously, however, no significant difference was found between achievement test scores for Negro and white students in seventh and eighth grades.[2] On the other hand, white students were significantly higher (at the 5 percent level) than Negro students in social status and scholastic ability. The differences, however, are not of overwhelming magnitude. Copiague does not have sharply different social levels among its people.

Negro students do not have poor attendance records and they do participate in school programs. Yet, the school newspaper staff consists entirely of white students, all of whom are in the highest track. Although Negro junior high school students do not account for a disproportionately high number of academic failures, neither do they earn a proportionate number of academic honors. Negroes, Gunthorpe concluded, were simply not being placed in a track according to their actual achievement. The principal factor in enforcing this discriminatory structure was the faculty: "Data tended to indicate that teacher standards for honors were geared toward the A track placement . . . . A number of Negro students could compete at the level of higher curriculum tracks."[3]

Wolman investigated the educational changes brought on by a transfer of Negro students in New Rochelle, New York.[4] Half the enrollment in a virtually all-Negro elementary school was transferred to various predominantly white schools. After one year, achievement tests were taken by all transferees. Changes in achievement registered by transferees in grades one through five were found to be statistically insignificant. Further analysis tried to get at possible social class factors in the situation. Means of the reading scores of Negro transferees and non-transferees were compared with those of the white children in the receiving school; the latter were significantly higher. The whites were socio-economically comparable with the Negro children; in other words, both were fairly low-income

Wolman then analyzed a year's achievement changes among the kindergarten children. Here she found a statistically significant change. Gains of this group exceeded those of the Negro non-transferees and the white receivers. Wolman interpreted the kindergarten experienc as another evidence of the importance of early intervention. "We can assume," she wrote, "that exposure to favorable learning circumstances at an early enough age can have a salutary and compensatory effect on the educational potential of minority and otherwise deprived children."[1] Unfortunately, no statistical data were presented in the article so that it is not possible to assess fully the research by Wolman .

Matzen studied the effect of racial composition upon achievement in the San Francisco Bay Area.[2] He stated his problem as "What is the relationship between the proportion of Negro children in a classroom and the mean scholastic achievement of Negro and non-Negro students?"[1] Eleven hundred students in eleven schools were tested; only Negroes and Caucasians were included. The tests were administered to fifth and seventh grade students from October 15 to November 1, 1963. Findings were reported in terms of four major relationships: (1) percent of Negroes and achievement; (2) percent of Negroes and mean intellectual ability; (3) mean intellectual ability and achievement; and (4) socioeconomic status and achievement.

1. In general, there was a tendency for achievement to vary inversely with PN (percent Negro), with, however, some "notable exceptions." Of 21 fifth-grade classrooms, data for five showed exceptional trends. For example, thirty-one students in classroom number 20 were below average in socioeconomic status, above average in achievement and I Q, and had far fewer Negroes than the average (5.9% vs. 51.7%). Classroom number 6 was considerably above average in I Q score, below average in achievement, and very high in percent Negro.

Matzen suggests that much of the negative relationship between PN and achievement may be attributable to common practices of classroom grouping. For example, relatively few high-achieving Negroes will often be placed in classrooms with high-achieving whites. Remaining in the classroom are primarily lower-achieving Negroes, thus producing a more negative relationship between race and achievement.

2. I Q, like achievement, tends to vary inversely with PN. Matzen stresses, however, the presence of "numerous exceptions" and characterizes the relationship between the two variables as "far from perfect."[1]

3. Achievement varies directly with socioeconomic position. While the entire student sample was heavily lower class, over half the fifth graders achieved above grade level. Only one third of the seventh graders were above grade level.

4. Matzen then tried to discover how achievement and PN were related when he held I Q and socioeconomic status constant. Achievement tended to fall as PN rose, but the tendency was not strong enough to reach statistical significance. Matzen acknowledged that white parents might nevertheless interpret the situation as demonstrating conclusively the negative influence of Negroes on white achievement. Because, however, achievement scores of Negro children also tend to decline as PN increases, Matzen wrote: "It appears that Negro parents may have stronger grounds than non-Negro parents for objecting to attendance boundaries which assign their children to predominantly Negro schools."[2]

And yet, PN and achievement were differently related in fifth grade than in seventh grade. One possible reason offered by Matzen is a difference in classroom grouping practices. In the fifth grade, students were much less homogeneously grouped than in seventh grade; therefore, Negro-white differentials were greater in grade five. In grade seven, on the other hand, grouping was quite homogeneous with bright Negro children being placed in classrooms with bright white children. Negro-white differences were thus minimized. In other words, in fifth grade you were as likely to find equal numbers of Negroes and whites in the low-scoring as in the high-scoring classrooms. In the seventh grade, high-scoring whites tended to be in one classroom, and low-scoring Negores in another one. In the latter case, the negative relation between PN achievement was high; in the former case, it was low.

Clearly, it is quite possible to interpret Matzen's findings as implying that the presence of Negroes must be minimized if achievement is to be maximized. Matzen prefers an alternative explanation, one that he calls "equally plausible." This is his suggestion that a new variable E Q (educational quality) be constructed. Making up this variable would be "indices of teacher competence and motivation, quality of textbooks and other instructional materials, enrichment-value of the classroom and school environment, and similar determiners, on the school's side, of how much pupils learn."[1] Matzen hypothesizes that E Q would be found to be negatively correlated with PN, and positively related to I Q, achievement, and socioeconomic position. In short, with schools of equal quality, the percent of Negroes in a classroom could no longer act negatively on achievement. But, adds Matzen, the racial composition of the classrooms "would still be a matter of great moment to parents and educators as a determiner of the social and emotional aspects of student development."[2]

Anderson studied the effect of desegregation on Negro children in Nashville.[1] Seventy-five Negro 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students in five desegregated schools were compared with a like number from three all-Negro schools. The former, who constituted from eight to thirty-three percent of enrollment in their schools, had attended desegregated schools up to six years. All children in the sample were from the same neighborhoods. Testing took place in May, 1963.

Academic achievement was significantly higher in the desegregated than in the segregated schools. Children who entered a desegregated school near the beginning of their school career achieved significantly better than segregated pupils. On the other hand, children who were desegregated only in fifth or sixth grade achieved less than did Negro children in the segregated schools. The significance of academic achievement in this research is impossible to gauge, inasmuch as no controls for social class were evident.

Radin compared Negro children in two Ypsilanti, Michigan, schools with respect to achievement and I Q scores.[2] An all-Negro school and a school whose enrollment is 45 percent Negro were used. Students were of like socioeconomic status, and there were no significant I Q score differences between both groups of students. A standard achievement test was administered at the beginning and the close of the 1964-1965 school year. Although all changes favored children in the integrated school, none of the changes was statistically significant.

There is some question about the integrated character of one school. Radin herself noted that "a 45 percent Negro enrollment does not represent genuine racial balance in the schools inasmuch as 21 percent of the entire population is non-white."[1] An independent check discovered that as of February 15, 1966, Ypsilanti's eleven elementary schools enrolled 21.9 percent Negro; 944 out of 4,312 were Negroes.[2] The 45 percent school would be classified as imbalanced or segregated under at least two measures: those of Robert A. Dentler and the California State Department of Education.[3] It would be difficult for such a school to escape the label of "Negro school" what with its predominantly Negro faculty and its exceptional racial composition in a city of only 25,000 people.

Lockwood studied certain factors in school achievement.[4] She compared Negro achievement in racially balanced (2) and imbalanced (5) schools in an upstate New York city over a two-year period. On a global comparison, no significant achievement differences were found between children in both types of school. However, when students were divided into groups who had attended balanced or imbalanced schools for two years or longer, a significant difference emerged in favor of the racially balanced children.[5]

During 1966, a series of studies of desegregation was made under the direction of Stout and Inger.[6] Their main interest was in the dynamics of community adoption of school desegregation. In the process of gathering data, the investigators recorded impressionistic generalizations about the learning effects of desegregation in the eight communities. In no sense was a formal evaluation done. It should be noted that desegregation was not introduced at the same time in each city.

Here are some extracts from the reports:[1]

> . . . We saw virtually no evidence of change in achievement levels among Negro children who participated in the various plans . . . . We conclude that no consistent change in achievement levels of participating Negro children is apparent, but that it is perhaps too soon to expect such change . . . . In four cities the achievement levels of Caucasian children whose schools act as receiving schools are not affected by the desegregation process. We found evidence of no change in the achievement levels of these children . . . . Some attemps were also made to alter the school program to account for the new circumstances . . . . It is too early to evaluate them . . . .

These tentative observations might prove of benchwork value to later researchers.

Beker and associates studied various aspects of desegregation in Syracuse, New York.[2] Through a series of administrative factors entirely beyond the power of the researchers to control, it proved impractical to reach many definitive conclusions. Several aspects of the study, however, remain noteworthy. One member of the research team, Hopi, investigated the residential status on student "assimilation." He studied the social adjustment of 656 students who entered four schools for the first time. Some had been transferred for reasons of desegregation; others, because their families had moved into the area. When both types of students were asked to gauge the effect of race and socioeconomic status on their social adjustment, most replied that these factors had not affected them. Teachers, on the other hand, disagreed. Hopi concluded that the students were nearer the truth.

Beker, after cautioning about the limited number of cases involved, concluded:

> ... The data ... offer little to support the claims of those who express the fear that disadvantaged Negro elementary school children will be "hurt" more if they are forced to compete with high-achieving, middle-class whites than they might be by attending more homogeneous, inner city schools. On the other hand, the results tend to confirm that there are marked differences in performance as well as social cleavages between the groups, and it seems apparent that desegregation did little to close such gaps in the course of the first year.[1]

Beker's study does not lend itself to a systematic evaluation.

Walker, Stinchcombe, and McDill studied certain aspects of desegregation in Baltimore.[2] In a penetrating analysis of the career of school segregation, they make many valuable comments on segregation as well as on the local situation. For present purposes, however, the most significant aspect of the Walker study is its innovative demonstration of the mathematics of educational disadvantage. Table I (Page 42) embodied the demonstration.[3]

The table estimates the total educational disadvantage of a Baltimore Negro student in twelfth grade as almost three years (2.91 grades); verbal ability is the criterion of disadvantage. Here is a summary description of each line in the table, assuming the case of a Negro student attending a seventy-percent Negro public school:

1. Considerably more than half the total disadvantage (1.83 grades) results from past deprivation.

2. Even if all Negro students were distributed equally among all the Baltimore public schools, a residual disadvantage in verbal ability would remain.
3. Lines 1 and 2 account for more than two thirds of the total disadvantage. These factors are not being caused by current conditions in Baltimore although they may be perpetuated by them.
4. Part of the disadvantage arises from the fact that very few Negroes reside in Baltimore County, outside Baltimore City. The resulting segregation adds another quantity of disadvantage.
5. Three quarters of the total disadvantage, i.e., 2.28 grades out of 2.91 grades, is attributable to past policies and their contemporary continuation outside Baltimore City itself.
6. Because of the over-representation of Negroes in Baltimore City, an additional disadvantage is present.
7. Because the private schools of Baltimore City are predominantly white while the public schools are predominantly Negro, an additional disadvantage arises from the concentration in public schools.
8. Assuming our example is a Negro attending a seventy-percent Negro school while the system as a whole has 61 percent Negroes, an additional educational disadvantage is imposed by attending this particular school.

Walker and colleagues also note that certain disadvantaging effects of family background are not included in the table.

TABLE I.

Estimated Components of Average Educational Disadvantage: Baltimore City Negro Students

Component	Estimated Disadvantage in Standard Deviation of Verbal Ability	Approximate Equivalent at 12th Grade
(1) Historical and sociological disadvantages of the average Negro in an all-white school	.61	1.83
(2) Additional disadvantage if Negroes nationally distributed exactly equally in all schools	.07	.21
(3) Total unrelated to current segregation, (1) + (2)	.68	2.04
(4) Due to segregation in Baltimore Metropolitan Area	.08	.24
(5) Total not influenced by local segregation, (3) + (4)	.76	2.28
(6) Due to segregation in Central City of Baltimore	.08	.24
(7) Due to private school segregation and predominance of Negroes in public schools	.11	.33
(8) Due to segregation within Baltimore City public schools	.02	.06
(9) Total estimated disadvantage*	.97	2.91

* This estimate eliminates certain effects of family background.

The table is not only valuable for analytical purposes but also as a basis for remedial action. For example, not far from one third the total disadvantage could be remedied by the creation of a metropolitan school district, including the City and County of Baltimore (lines 4, 6, 7, and 8) in which private schools were required to desegregate. The table also underscores the great challenge of overcoming the historical deficit.

In 1967, McPartland studied the effect of school and classroom desegregation on academic achievement.[1] He used verbal achievement test scores derived from 5,075 Negro ninth-graders in New England and Middle Atlantic states. The principal findings are reported in Table 2.

It will be noted that McPartland's work was directly relevant to several research questions that had arisen in earlier investigation.

1. Do racial effects in achievement persist even when social class factors are taken into account?
2. Is there a different racial effect on achievement in desegregated schools as contrasted with desegregated classrooms?
3. Are racial effects on achievement simply artifacts of ability grouping procedures?

Let us examine his findings.

Five generalizations can be made. One, racial classroom desegregation has a positive effect on achievement, and this influence is for the most part independent of family background; compare lines 1 and 2.

Two, "... regardless of the racial composition of the school, the average achievement of Negro students increases with the proportion of their classmates who are white;"[1] compare lines 2 and 3. Three, the "whiter" the school, the more beneficial is classroom desegregation to the Negro child; compare lines 3a - 3d. Four, "... when classroom racial composition as well as family background differences are held constant, there is no evidence that the percent white enrolled in the school generally has any appreciable influence on Negro student achievement;"[2] compare lines 5 and 6. Five, "... Negro students who remain in segregated classes receive no benefit in terms of their academic growth from attendance at desegregated schools .... Segregated classes may be more detrimental for Negro student achievement if they occur in mostly white schools rather than mostly Negro schools;"[3] compare lines 6a-b and 6c-d.

Matzen, it will be recalled, concluded that ability grouping accounted for a good deal of what appeared to be racial differentials in achievement. While McPartland, too, found school selection processes to play a role, it was a dintinctly minor one. He concluded, therefore, that the desegregative effect in classrooms could not be explained by the schools' selection processes, and that race was an autonomous factor.

McPartland's study utilized raw data that were gathered originally for the Coleman Report (see below, Chapter 6). It also reflects the re-analysis of these data that was done for the Racial Isolation study of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (see below, Chapter 6).

TABLE 2.

Weighted Parameters of Main Effects on Ninth Grade Negro Student Verbal Achievement, Under Different Control Conditions*

Effect Variable	Effect Parameter	
1. Proportions white classmates (3 comparisons)	+.16	
2. Proportion white classmates, controlling family background (18)	+.13	
3. Proportion white classmates, controlling family background and percent white in school (72)	+.13	
(a) 0 - 19 percent white in school (18)		+.07
(b) 20 - 49 percent white in school (18)		+.16
(c) 50 - 69 percent white in school (18)		+.19
(d) 70 - 99 percent white in school (18)		+.34
4. Percent white in school (3)	+.13	
5. Percent white in school, controlling family background (18)	+.11	
6. Percent white in school, controlling family background and proportion white classmates (72)	+.02	
(a) No white classmates (18)		-.03
(b) Less than half white classmates (18)		-.02
(c) About half white classmates (18)		+.03
(d) More than half white classmates (18)		+.09

* The numbers in parentheses are the number of comparisons which were combined in the weighted average of achievement increments. Each value in this table is based on 5,075 cases.

Evaluated in its own right, the McPartland research is outstanding for its rigor as well as its sensitivity to the central research concerns of the field. All in all, it sets a very high standard, not least for its brevity: it is only 16 pages long.

Graves and Bedell reported on an evaluation of achievement in the White Plains desegregation experience.[1] In 1964, the school board had established a desegregation plan whereby each of the city's ten elementary schools was to enroll from 10 to 30 percent Negro. A predominantly Negro school was closed down and five segregated white schools were balanced. The Graves-Bedell evaluation made three comparisons: (a) between two groups of white students before and after desegregation; (b) between two groups of inner city students both before and since desegregation, and (c) another more restricted comparison of the latter type. Stanford Achievement Tests were used.

Comparison A. One hundred fifty white students were compared with one hundred twenty-nine other white students. The latter attended the same schools that the former had attended, only now they were desegregated. What was the impact of desegregation on academic achievement? None, apparently. In tests on paragraph meaning and word meaning, the 129 had made higher scores; in tests on arithmetic reasoning and computation, the 150 were higher. Judged by changes in median test scores, desegregation in White Plains had not interfered with the generally high level of academic achievement by white students.

Comparison B. The scores of thirty-six children who had been enrolled in now-closed segregated Rochambeau School and thirty-three children who lived in the same area but now attended racially-balanced schools were compared. In paragraph meaning and arithmetic reasoning, the children in the racially-balanced schools had gained more. In arithmetic computation, the segregated children gained more. In word meaning, there were similar outcomes. It also was reported that during two years a larger percentage of racially-balanced children than segregated children had made as much as one and one-half years' academic progress in all four achievement test areas (85% vs. 67%). It is possible, then, that desegregation benefited the achievement of these children, even if only slightly.

Comparison C. Two groups of inner city children -- one consisting of forty-four and the other of thirty-three -- were compared to discover whether children who had attended balanced schools between first and third grades (the 44) achieved more than those who had attended balanced schools only since the start of third grade (the 33). In tests of paragraph meaning, word meaning, and arithmetic reasoning, the former were from five to fifteen percentile points ahead; on arithmetic computation, both groups had the same percentile rank. Unfortunately, the report did not present statistics measuring the absolute progress of these two groups on any of the four tests; accordingly, it is not possible to affirm or contradict the statement in the report that the group of 44 "is achieving slightly better."[1]

The White Plains report suffers from several weaknesses. First, no tests of statistical significance are presented so that the reported score differences cannot be properly evaluated. Second, there is reason to doubt that the comparisons are strictly racial. For example, when Rochambeau School was closed down in June, 1964, its enrollment was 61.7 percent Negro.[1] Thus, a considerable number of white students apparently lived in the attendance area and were enrolled in Rochambeau. Indeed, the Graves-Bedell report describes the inner city sample as "children, predominantly Negro, living in the center city . . . ."[2] Third, as pointed out above, in Comparison C no conclusion as to student progress can be reached because of the absence of data on absolute test scores. In all, the Graves-Bedell report failed to document adequately the educative value of the White Plains experiment in desegregation. It is equally clear that nothing in the report as presently written can be said to disprove the value of the White Plains experiment.[3]

IV. Studies of Busing

Busing programs are usually designed for practical ends -- improved instruction, relief of overcrowding, and desegregation -- rather than research purposes. Thus, little or no time is commonly taken beforehand to provide for a systematic research exploration of the variables at work. For the most part, the available studies of busing have been hardly more than retrospective retracings of isolated variables. Nevertheless, their quality varies and some are more instructive than others.

The East Harlem Project conducted a study of the busing of Puerto Rican and Negro children from two East Harlem schools to a white middle-class Yorkville school.[1] A majority of children were reported to show "dramatic improvement in their school work, and in their attendance."[2] Bused children came from families whose socioeconomic status and/or education was above average. Hammond, Sawhill, and Williams studied 224 Negro students who participated in a busing program in Seattle.[3] The students were drawn from ten schools and entered thirty-two schools. While their attendance records improved sharply in their new schools, their school record as measured by grades suffered: " . . . 43 percent of the total group are doing poorer than they did last year, 41 percent are doing the same, and 6 percent are doing better."[4] Because no achievement test scores are reported, however, it is not possible to know whether the absolute achievement of bused children rose or fell.

In Syracuse, New York, two busing programs were evaluated by the city schools. In the first, a group of Negro children was bused from Croton to Edward Smith school. At the end of the school year, white children at Smith showed their customary achievement gain. The bused children failed to gain any more than the children who had remained at Croton.[5] In the second program, students from Croton were bused to Washington Irving School. As in the previous case, white children at the host school continued to improve in reading at their customary rate. The children from Croton, however, gained significantly more than the children who remained in Croton. The 30 bused pupils achieved a mean growth in months of 8.53, the non-bused children, 4.17.[1]

Jonsson studied various aspects of a busing program in Berkeley, California.[2] Certain schools attended by concentrations of children from poverty families were desegregated as "target schools," and received special aid under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A group of students from the target schools was bused to predominantly white schools. Jonsson reported that the 1966-1967 achievement scores for bused pupils "were above the average of target pupils, and their growth increased this achievement differential . . . ."[3] The bused students had been somewhat above the average at the target schools. On the other hand, Jonsson declares that "their gains . . . are consistently greater than one would predict from initial differences."[4]

Teele, Jackson, and Mayo reported on a preliminary study of Operation Exodus, a voluntary busing program in Boston.[5] One hundred three mothers of children in the program were interviewed during February - June, 1966. Many mothers cited two bits of evidence as indices of improved education: the bused children were being assigned more homework and far fewer children reported having substitute teachers as had been the case in their old schools.

Beker, in the study described earlier, had reported that a one-year busing program in Syracuse had not brought about any significant improvement in academic achievement by the bused children. A later study, done by Ayer, "showed that the reading achievement of bused pupils was significantly higher after one year than was that of a matched comparison group at the predominantly Negro school even though there had been no difference between the groups in reading achievement at the beginning of the year."[1]

V. Evaluational Studies

In New York City, several experimental programs have been inaugurated within the school system with the formal purpose of providing "quality integrated education." At least one other project that included this purpose originally later dropped it (More Effective Schools program).

Here is a list of such integration programs which have been evaluated in any formal sense:[2]

1. Free Choice Open Enrollment: Elementary and Junior High Schools
2. Community Zoning Program (Pairing)
3. Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Comprehensive High School
4. A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas

The Evaluations of these programs are almost completely without value for the present research purposes. Ethnic data are sometimes reported school-by-school but never by classroom. Achievement data, however, always are reported by grade groups or simply in two gross tables: Negro-Puerto Rican and Other. The student cannot tell what relationships exist between achievement and ethnicity. Nor can one probe into unusually promising practices at this or that school. Socioeconomic controls are rarely if ever specified and so changes can as easily be attributed to one factor as another.

It should be clear that the present report is examining the evaluations only from the viewpoint of their research importance. The evaluative studies may or may not be, in addition, perfectly good scholarly products as legally required formal evaluations. In any event, none of these evaluations can be considered as having provided a research test of any of the types of programs under evaluation. A limited research use of these and related studies can be made where closely similar programs are being compared and the specific outcome of the programs is the point of interest.[1] In their defense, too, it should be observed that the evaluation staff was often called in almost as an afterthought. This is not a very propitious context for meaningful research.

VI. Conclusions

Let us now return to the question that opened this chapter: How has racial desegregation affected academic achievement? The evidence is strong that desegregation benefits the academic achievement of Negro children. In a few cases, no such stimulative value of desegregation was found; and in a rare case or two, Negro children's achievement fell. The evidence is even stronger that white children fail to suffer any learning disadvantage from desegregation. These positive conclusions are supported, in turn, by the U. S. Office of Education Coleman Report and the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Racial Isolation report, discussed below in Chapter 6.

If, however, the fact of accomplishment under desegregation is clear, the reasons for the accomplishment are by no means clear. The next question we must consider is: Why has racial desegregation had a positive learning effect on Negro children? We thereupon necessarily enter the far more complicated and subtle arena of motivation, feelings, and aspirations.

FOOTNOTES

Page 9

1. Several experimental studies of desegregation, especially by Katz, are considered in the following chapter inasmuch as they seem more relevant to the problem of constructing a theory of desegregation.

Page 11

1. Southern School News, October 1, 1954, p. 13.

2. Ibid., July, 1956, p. 2.

3. Ibid., December, 1956, p. 5.

Page 12

1. Harold A. Ferguson and Richard L. Plaut, "Talent: To Develop or to Lose," Educational Record, April, 1954, p. 138.

2. Jacob Landers, Higher Horizons Progress Report (N.Y.: Board of Education, 1963), p. 9.

3. Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change (N. Y.: HARYOU, 1964), pp. 168-170. This was a test of reading comprehension.

4. Jacob Landers, "A Letter to the Editor," Integrated Education, February - March, 1967, pp. 48-49.

5. Wallace A. Kennedy, V. Van de Riet, and James C. White, The Standardization of the 1960 Revising of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States (Talahassee: Human Development Clinic, Florida State University, 1961), pp. 144, 146.

6. Wallace A. Kennedy, "A Follow-Up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement," unpublished paper read to the 1966 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, pp. 11, 16.

7. HARYOU, Youth in the Ghetto, p. 179.

Page 13

1. Daniel Schreiber in Invitational Conference on Northern School Desegregation, Proceedings, (N. Y.: Yeshiva University, 1962), pp. 46 - 47.

2. Albert J. Harris and Robert J. Lovinger, Some Longitudinal Data on I Q Changes in the Intelligence of Negro Adolescents (N. Y.: City University of New York, 1967), p. 2.

3. Ralph Scott, "First to Ninth Grade I Q Changes of Northern Negro Students," Psychology in the Schools, April, 1966, p. 159.

4. Martin Deutsch and Bert Brown, "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, April, 1964, p. 30.

Page 14

1. Howard H. Long, "Test Results of Third-Grade Negro Children Selected on the Basis of Socioeconomic Status, 1," Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935).

2. Ibid., p. 551.

Page 15

1. Marion Jacob Mayo, "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro," reprinted from the Archives of Psychology, No. 28, November, 1913, pp. 25 and 45.

2. Ibid., p. 21.

3. Paul A. Witty and A. I. Decker, "A Comparative Study of the Educational Attainment of Negro and White Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XVIII (1927).

4. Ibid., p. 500.

5. Mary R. Crowley, "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School," Journal of Negro Education, 1 (1932). A critique of this study can be found in Howard Hale Long, "Some Psychogenic Hazards of Segregated Education of Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935).

6. Ibid., p. 31.

Page 16

1. Committee on Race and Education, Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools (Portland, Ore.: Board of Education, Oct. 29, 1964), p. 113.

2. Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin, The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges (N. Y.: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963), p. 26.

3. Ibid., p. 21.

Page 17

1. Aaron M. Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Illinois, 1965. University Microfilm No. 65-7076.

2. Ibid., p. 67.

3. Ibid., p. 65.

Page 18

1. Ibid., p. 93.

2. Ibid., p. 85.

3. See, also, Aaron Bindman, "Pre-College Preparation of Negro College Students," Journal of Negro Education, Fall, 1966.

4. Norman J. Johnson, Robert Wyer, and Neil Gilbert, "Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study," Phylon, Fall, 1967, pp. 223-224.

Page 19

1. Ibid., p. 228.

Page 20

1. Taken from Integrated Education, August-September, 1966, p. 10.

2. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Conference on Education (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959) and Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint, Gatlinburg, Tennessee (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960).

3. Herbert W. Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation. A Guidebook (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959).

4. Herbert W. Wey, "Desegregation -- It Works," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964.

Page 21

1. Ibid.

2. Carl F. Hansen, "The Scholastic Performance of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," Harvard Educational Review, Summer, 1960.

3. J. Kenneth Morland, Token Desegregation and Beyond (N. Y.: Anti-Defamation League, 1963).

4. Alfred D. Wiley, A Study of Desegregation in the Evansville School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Education, Indiana University, 1961. Summary in Dissertation Abstracts, XXII (1962) 3477.

5. Charles Monroe, "A 'Basic Program' in Junior College," Integrated Education, January, 1963.

6. Philip M. Hauser, chairman, Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago, by the Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools (Chicago: Board of Education, March 31, 1964), p. 86.

Page 22

1. See Henry T. Hillson and Florence C. Myers, The Demonstration Guidance Project, 1957-1962. Pilot Program for Higher Horizons (N. Y.: Board of Education, 1963) and New York City Board of Education, Demonstration Guidance Project, Fourth Annual Progress Report, 1959-1960 (N.Y.: Board of Education, 1961).

2. Morris I. Berkowitz, Studies of School Desegregation and Achievement. A Summary (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Commission on Human Relations, May, 1967), pp. 5 - 6.

3. Merle H. Elliott and Alden W. Badal, "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," California Journal of Educational Research, September, 1965; Dumbarton Research Council, Race and Education in the City of Oakland. Draft. An unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Menlo Park, California, October, 1966.

Page 23

1. Race and Education in the City of Oakland, pp. 114-115.

Page 24

1. Ibid., fn. 1, p. 123.

2. Ibid.

Page 25

1. See Frank H. Stallings, "A Study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1959; and Stalling's statement in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 148.

Page 26

1. Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965), p. 4.

2. Irwin Katz, "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," American Psychologist, June, 1964, p. 384.

3. Thomas F. Pettigrew, A Profile of the Negro American (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 128.

4. See Ivan G. Samuels, Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, Indiana University, 1958. University Microfilm No. 58-2934.

Page 27

1. Ibid., p. 100.

2. See James H. Fortenberry, The Achievement of Negro Pupils in Mixed and Non-Mixed Schools, unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959. University Microfilm No. 59-5492.

Page 28

1. Ibid., p. 44.

2. Albert W. Spruill, Consequences Encountered by Negro Teachers in the Process of Desegregation of Schools in Four Southern States, unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1958, p. 133. University Microfilm No. 59-1518.

3. See William G. Katzenmeyer, Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils, unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-2227.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

Page 29

1. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

2. Ibid., p. 64.

Page 30

1. Ibid., pp. 56-59.

2. See table in ibid., p. 57.

3. Ibid., p. 67.

Page 31

1. Gerald S. Lesser, Kristine M. Rosenthal, Sally E. Polkoff, and Marjorie B. Pfankuch, "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," Integrated Education, June - July, 1964.

2. Ibid., p. 21.

3. Ibid.

4. Muriel B. Gunthorpe, A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School Program, unpub- Ed. D. dissertation, New York University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-8477.

Page 32

1. Ibid., p. 83.

2. Ibid., p. 97.

3. Ibid., p. 163.

4. T. G. Wolman, "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle," Integrated Education, December, 1964 - January, 1965.

Page 33

1. Ibid., p. 31.

2. Stanley P. Matzen, The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-2518.

Page 34

1. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

Page 35

1. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 100.

Page 36

1. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

Page 37

1. Louis V. Anderson, *The Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement and Personality Patterns of Negro Children*, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966. University Microfilm No. 66-11, 237.

2. Norma Radin, *A Comparison of the Test Performance of Negro Students Attending All-Negro and Integrated Elementary Schools in One Community*, Ypsilanti, Michigan Public Schools, April 15, 1966, unpublished.

Page 38

1. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

2. Telephone discussion with Miss Delores Tripp, School Specialist, Michigan Civil Rights Commission, December 7, 1967.

3. See Robert A. Dentler, "A Basis for Classifying Ethnic Composition of Schools," Memorandum No. 5 of the Education Complex Study (N. Y.: Center for Urban Education); and California State Department of Education, *Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools, Part One: Distribution of Pupils, Fall, 1966* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, March, 1967).

4. Jane D. Lockwood, *An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools*, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966. University Microfilms No. 67-8303.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

6. Robert Stout and Morton Inger, *School Desegregation: Progress in Eight Cities*, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966). See Chapter 12, "The Effects of Desegregation." The cities surveyed were Berkeley, White Plains, Teaneck, N. Y., Greenburgh Distruct No. 8, New York, Pottsville, Pa., Englewood, N. J., Syracuse, N. Y. and Rochester, N. Y.

Page 39

1. Ibid., chapter 12, pp. 6, 8, 9, and 16.

2. Jerome Beker, A Study of Integration in Racially Imbalanced Urban Public Schools. A Demonstration and Evaluation. Final Report (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, May, 1967.)

Page 40

1. Ibid., p. 354.

2. Dollie Walker, Arthur S. Stinchcombe, and Mary S. McDill, School Desegregation in Baltimore (Baltimore, Md.: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, August, 1967).

3. Ibid., p. 27.

Page 43

1. James McPartland, The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students. Interim Report (Baltimore, Md.: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, September, 1967).

Page 44

1. Ibid., p. 3.

2. Ibid., p. 4.

3. Ibid.

Page 46

1. Marian F. Graves and Frederick D. Bedell, A Three Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan (White Plains, N.Y.: Board of Education, October 16, 1967).

Page 47

1. Ibid., p. 30.

Page 48

1. White Plains Public Schools, "Analysis of Pupil Registration by School Showing Per Cent Negro." August 30, 1967.

2. A Three Year Evaluation, p. 3 (emphasis added).

3. For an account of such an [invalid] charge made by local critics of White Plains desegregation, see New York Times, November 10, 1967.

Page 49

1. East Harlem Project and City Commission on Human Rights, Releasing Human Potential. A Study of East Harlem - Yorkville School Bus Transfer (N.Y.: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962).

2. Ibid., p. 2.

3. Alpha J. Hammond, Lucy M. Sawhill, and Robert B. Williams, A Survey of the Adjustment of the Negro Students Who Transferred to Schools Outside Their Neighborhoods During 1963-1964 Under the New Seattle School Board Ruling, unpublished Master of Social Work Project, University of Washington, 1964.

4. Ibid., p. 48.

5. Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, New York, "Study of the Effect of Integration -- Croton and Edward Smith Elementary School Pupils," pp. 327-328 in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966 (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

Page 50

1. Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, N.Y., "Study of the Effect of Integration -- Washington Irving and Host Pupils," pp. 323-326 in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966 (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

2. Harold A. Jonsson, Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I Compensatory Activities for 1966-67 (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Unified School District, 1967).

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ibid.

5. James E. Teele, Ellen Jackson, and Clara Mayo, "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," pp. 297-314 in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Boston, Massachusetts, October 4-5, 1966 (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967); see, also, Dan Woods, "A Brief History of Operation Exodus," Integrated Education, October-November, 1966.

Page 51

1. Beker, A Study of Integration, p. 383.

2. Evaluations covering the school year 1965-1966 are: David J. Fox, Free Choice Open Enrollment -- Elementary Schools (N. Y.: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966) and Robert L. Thorndike, Free Choice Open Enrollment -- Junior High Schools (N. Y.: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966). Summaries of the Center for Urban Education evaluation for 1966-1967 are in Bernard E. Donovan's, Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-1968. Title I -- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (N. Y.: Board of Education, August 30, 1967), pp. 99-103.

See Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program. Summary Report (N. Y.: Board of Education, September, 1966).

See "Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Comprehensive High School," July 31, 1967, a 5 1/2 page typewritten draft summary report prepared, apparently, by the Center for Urban Education.

See "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas," in Donovan, Summary of Proposed Programs, pp. 110-113, prepared by the Center for Urban Education.

Page 52

1. See, for example, the use made of data on the More Effective Schools Program and the Community Zoning Program in Meyer Weinberg, Report on Techniques for Achieving Racially Desegregated Superior Quality Education in the Public Schools of Chicago, Illinois, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, October 23, 1967.

CHAPTER III

ASPIRATIONS AND SELF-CONCEPT

Aspirations and self-concept are at the core of the motivation to learn. Yet, little is known about their role in education. Through a process of circular reasoning, these elements are almost always viewed as properties of individual students. That is, if children are learning they are assumed to be expressing some degree of aspiration and a more or less sound self-concept. If they are not learning satisfactorily, there is an automatic tendency to attribute the failing to a lack of motivation. This, in turn, is often translated as low aspirations and poor self- concept.

What, however, is to be made of the situation wherein aspirations are high and self-concept is sound -- and still no satisfactory learning occurs? Attention should then shift away from the isolated child and toward social factors -- race is pre-eminent among these -- for possible light on the subject.

In the remainder of the chapter are reviewed a number of studies dealing with both aspirations and self-concept. To be sure, there is no line between the two. Nevertheless, for purposes of analysis it is convenient to separate them. In the next chapter, the group or intergroup aspects of aspiration and self-concept are discussed.

1. Aspirations

"There is," writes Coleman, "A peculiar and ill-understood phenomenon that appears to characterize many Negores, adults and youth: a high, unrealistic, idealized aspiration, relatively unconnected to those actions that ordinarily lead to achievement of a goal."[1] Five years earlier, the Ausubels had summarized research as indicating that the depressed social and personal condition of Negro youths led to low academic and vocational aspirations.[2] Thus, in a short five-year period, scientific opinion had shifted from a model of low to high Negro aspirations.

The shift in opinion was by no means arbitrary. Between 1962 and 1967 especially, Negro Americans had in fact formulated a new self-awareness that shot their aspirations sky-high.[3] To aspire is to hope, and the civil rights movement symbolized new hope for the oppressed. The realism and practicality of the rising aspirations are, of course, open to examination. It should, however, be noted that the same can be said about all of man's hopes.

In the past, what appeared to be low aspirations by Negro youth sometimes turned out to be quite something else. As Logan reported a generation ago:

> In the Boston public school system a few white teachers, who hardly act on their own initiative, are becoming increasingly bolder in their efforts to discourage colored students from going to the college preparatory high schools and to white colleges. In one school, a separate assembly of colored students was ordered for

> the purpose of extolling to them the virtues of manual training and of colored schools.[1]

The example was not unique.

Even before the 1960's, however, some studies reported higher vocational and/or educational aspirations among Negro than among white youth.[2] In 1952, for example, Boyd's study of Portland, Oregon, matched white and Negro students by socioeconomic status and I Q and still found Negro children to have the higher aspirations.[3]

Nam, Rhodes, and Herriott analyzed data from the decennial censuses as well as later data collected by the Census Bureau relating to unequal educational opportunities. Some of their findings relevant to aspirations follow:[4]

> Among white-collar families, Negroes are far more likely [than whites] to plan on going to college; among lower-status families, the racial difference is small and favors Negroes .... There is a tendency for Negro students to plan for a higher level of education than their mothers expect them to attain (especially in lower-status families). The study reveals a large discrepancy between the enrollment status and the plans of students in the low-income and non-white-collar groups of the central cities -- particularly for Negroes. The majority of the students in these groups say they plan to go to college, yet it is just these groups that have the highest rates of nonenrollment.

The researchers did not restrict these generalizations to any special section of the country.

Since 1960, a number of more or less controlled studies have been made of Negro-white differences in aspiration, both under conditions of school segregation and desegregation.

Blake studied level of aspiration in a suburban area near a large midwestern city.[1] He matched three groups of students on socioeconomic status, I Q, and achievement:

Group W: 59 white students from integrated high schools
Group N1: 59 Negro students from integrated high schools
Group NS: 59 Negro students from segregated high schools

In the integrated schools, Negroes were a minority but the schools were not transitional to Negro. The school administrators were reputedly fair to Negro children.

Blake set out to test four hypotheses:[2]

> 1. On the average, Negro pupils will have higher levels of aspiration than those of their white counterparts in the mixed school situation.
>
> 2. There will be greater variability in the aspirations of the minority group in the segregated school system than in the mixed school system.
>
> 3. The Negro pupils in the mixed school sampel will show a higher average level of aspiration than the Negroes in segregated school samples.
>
> 4. The average aspiration will be approximately the same for whites and the segregated school group, but there will be greater variability in the segregated Negro group.

Let us now examine the findings.

Negro students in integrated schools did set higher aspirational levels than did their white fellow students. The first hypothesis was thus supported. On the other hand, the second hypothesis was rejected. Negro students in the segregated schools did not set a wider range of aspirational levels than both other groups; indeed, they set fewer low aspirational levels than either Negroes or whites in integrated schools. So, too, was the third hypothesis rejected. Negroes in the integrated schools failed to set higher average aspirational levels than Negroes in segregated schools. Finally, the fourth hypothesis was rejected inasmuch as segregated Negro students had higher average levels of aspiration than did whites in integrated schools. The segregated Negro students were the highest aspiring of all three groups.

Blake interprets the high aspirations of segregated Negroes as a defensive measure whereby the student attempts to maintain his self-esteem. To set a low goal might be interpreted by others as an admission of lower self-esteem. It is not desegregation but segregation, in Blake's opinion, that threatens the Negro's self-esteem: "The more rigidly segregated total environment is much more constantly devaluing to the Negro."[1] Blake rejects an alternative explanation which holds that because the segregated school is a protective environment against the harsh reality of discrimination, Negro children find it "safer to set high goals with or without expecting to attain them."[2]

Be that as it may, two points should be kept in mind. One, that integrated Negro students of like intelligence, socioeconomic status, and achievement set higher aspirational levels than did their white counterparts. Two, despite the matching, the segregated Negro children responded defensively. They were, in other words, not able to accept themselves as realistically as did the integrated Negro students.

In 1960 Wilson studied the social aspects of aspirations in the public schools of Berkeley, California.[3] He had three aims: "... To determine the extent of the differences in social composition between the elementary schools, to confirm the relationship between familial background and academic achievement and aspirations, but, particularly, to investigate how the differing school milieux might modify this relationship."[1]

Wilson found, as expected, that children of higher social status achieved more than did children of a lower status. More interestingly, however, he also found that children from roughly similar social backgrounds achieved along a wide range. A key to these discrepancies turned out to be what might be called the social geography of the Berkeley schools: families of the highest social status were concentrated in the Hills; of the next highest, in the Foothills, and of the lowest, in the Flats. At the same time, each geographical area also contained some families of every social group. In speaking of academic achievement, Wilson reports: "The children of professionals in the Foothills attained a poorer average than their compeers in the Hills; the children of manual workers in the Foothills, almost equalling the white-collar group in the same schools, were far superior to those in the Flats."[2]

In other words, academic achievement was found to depend not on broad social status affiliation but on the social climate of the school. Children of the same social background achieved more if they attended a higher-status school. This held for children of every social status. At the same time, Wilson discovered that teachers tended to allocate school marks according to social class criteria. In lower-status schools, where teachers employed lower academic standards, children of high status received as many A's and B's, for example, as did their social counterparts in upper status schools.

When it comes to aspirations, according to Wilson, social status factors do not operate in as clear-cut a manner. In fact, "more Negroes in the Flats, where they are a majority, have high aspirations, than in the Foothills, where they are a minority."[1] School children, however, tend to adopt the aspirations of their peers. In the Flats, each child has much more contact with other children who do not aspire to college, for example. And the non-college aspirants make up a very cohesive group. "Relatively, then, terminal students are the social leaders in the lower socioeconomic strata. They gain social support from their peers, and, in turn, set the pace for them, without adopting the standards of success prevalent in the wider community of adults."[2] In the Hills more children are isolates whose very isolation protects their high aspirations from the corrosive effect of low achievers.

Wilson views the segregation of Negroes in Berkeley schools from the standpoint of constructive group functioning: The presence of high aspirations among lower-class Negroes demonstrates "that a segregated social minority can generate and maintain higher hopes than when integrated. It can develop its indigenous leadership, and is not demoralized by continuous tokens of their imposed inferiority."[3] Clearly, a fundamental conflict exists between Blake's and Wilson's interpretations of the psychological content of segregation. Blake, as we have seen, regarded segregation as "constantly devaluing to the Negro" whereas Wilson states that segregation prevents demoralization of the segregated. A crucial question remains: Is the sense of "imposed inferiority" more intense under segregation than under integration? The weight of the evidence presented in the remainder of this chapter probably supports the view that segregation is more destructive.

Geisel studied Negro and white aspirations in Nashville, Tennessee.[1] He compared 1,245 white with 777 Negro students in 7th, 8th, and 12th grades. While white students had a significantly higher mean I Q score (108.2 and 89.7), Negro vocational and educational goals were significantly higher.[2] Geisel observed that significant differences between Negroes and whites existed not only in I Q and aspiration scores, but also with respect to "participation patterns, attitudes, and self- and life-concept dimensions for both upper and lower socioeconomic status group."[3]

Extracurricular school activities were distinctly white specialties. Negro students, on the other hand, were highly active in the Negro community. (It should be recalled that Nashville in this period was a leading center of southern civil rights activity.) As Geisel put it: "The school is a status symbol but the outside activities are where Negroes can enjoy life."[4]

Within the school itself, the teacher plays a most important role for the Negro child:

> The teacher for the white child is likely to be simply an instrumental agent of the school. For the Negro child she also represents a status position and a respected social role . . . . The Negro child who feels he is important in the eyes of the teacher is optimistic about the future and also thinks that education is every important. This pattern is much less pronounced for white youth.[5]

By inference, the significantly higher self-concept scores registered by Negroes might well reflect this more personal meaning of school and especially of the teacher.

The values of the Negro subcommunity are reflected in vocational choices of Negro youth. About half of the Negro students said they wanted to become teachers, physicians, lawyers, social workers, ministers, morticians, and nurses.[1] These are vocations that can be practiced directly within the Negro community. A recent study seemed to interpret Geisel's finding about concentration in "Negro" careers as a southern phenomenon.[2] Bindman, in his study of Negro students at the University of Illinois, found the same more or less true in the north: " (1) Negro students are occupationally oriented in selecting their colleges and courses of study, and (2) Negro students select careers in which they can be reasonably certain of finding remunerative employment."[3]

Yet, the psychological threat of the white community takes its toll, especially as evidenced by responses by twelfth-grade students in Geisel's sample. By that time, Negro-white differences in educational aspirations have largely disappeared. Tests on students' perceptions anomie and blocks for the future show the greatest sensitivity "in twelfth grade where contact and potential competition with whites in the occupations world is imminent."[4] Realism marks the choice of fields of vocational concentration as it marks the apprehensiveness felt by the soon-to-be graduate.

Over a period of one year, P.S. 198 in Manhattan, a six-grade school, was desegregated. The student body was divided: 1/2 Puerto Rican, 1/3 Negro and 1/6 other. Children were tested in October, 1960, and June, 1961.[5]

Children's vocational aspirations were found to vary with the social composition of the classroom. Without exception, when children were an ethnic minority in a classroom, fewer chose a professional or semi-professional occupation. The tendency was strongest among Negroes and weakest among white non-Puerto Ricans. In addition, both Negro and Puerto Rican sutdents were more expressive in classes in which they were a minority than a majority. White non-Puerto Ricans showed an opposite tendency.

Powell studied the aspirations of talented Negro youth in the segregated schools of Alabama.[1] His sample was one hundred 11th and 12th grade students who scored very high on the California Test of Mental Maturity: above the 85th percentile on the national norm and between the 93rd and 99th percentiles on Alabama statewide norms.[2] Nearly 40 of the 100 did not plan on attending college. As several of them explained to Powell: "I don't have the money to attend college and if I did attend all I could do would be to teach school or carry mail."[3] Of the 81 planning to attend college, 46 hoped to attend a desegregated college; all but four of this group hoped to attend such a college outside the South. (Data were collected during 1959; several years afterward, probably even more of the students would have considered desegregated colleges.)

Three factors were found to influence a student's decision to seek a college education: (1) college attendance by a sibling; (2) the presence of a counselor in the high school; and (3) strong maternal approval. The decision was not dependent on the father's occupation or income.

Vocational aspirations were heavily in the direction of teaching: 58 percent of the boys and 41 percent of the girls.[1] Nearly three quarters of the non-college bound boys wanted to learn a skilled trade.[2]

Gist and Bennett investigated aspirations in four Kansas City high schools; 412 Negro students were compared with 461 white students.[3] When I Q and socioeconomic status were held constant, no significant differences existed on either occupational or educational aspiration. Geisel had found significant differences between Negro and white to the point where he declared: "... We have rediscovered sub-culture."[4] Gist and Bennett, however, declare flatly: "... This study seems to add to the growing evidence that there is no such thing as a Negro sub-culture when general attitudes toward occupations or education are the focus of attention."[5] Part of the difference between these two conclusions may lie with the degree that socioeconomic influences were controlled in both studies. Gist and Bennett claim only to have "crudely controlled"[6] such influences while Geisel states that his Negro and white subjects "are obviously not truly comparable."[7] Another part may be the expression of two quite different Negro populations.

Gottlieb studied Negro-white differences in aspirations and fulfillment in seven high schools.[8] His sample was divided into four types of students:

1. All students in two all-Negro high schools in the South.

2. All students in two all-white high schools in the South.

3. A twenty-five percent sample of Negro and white students in a northern interracial high school.

4. A twenty-five percent sample of Negro students in an all-Negro high school in the North.

Negroes had higher college-going aspirations, and Negroes from southern segregated schools had higher aspirations than Negroes in the interracial northern school. Expectations diverged from aspirations; the two were less discrepant among southern Negro students, more discrepant among Negroes in interracial schools.

Gottlieb then probed the relationship between goal fulfillment and teachers. It was hypothesized that student-teacher involvement would be at its peak "where the student perceived goal consensus and an ability as well as desire on the part of the teacher in the goal-attainment process."[1]

White students tended to believe that they and their teachers shared common goals; this tendency was strengthened as social class of student rose. Negroes, however, tended to see a discrepancy between their goals and those held by teachers. No racial difference existed in students' assessment of their teachers' ability to help students attain their goals. With respect to teachers' desire to help, however, an important difference existed: "... Lower socioeconomic youth and especially Negro youth are least likely to perceive the teacher as someone with a desire to facilitate goal attainment."[2] Gottlieb speculated: "It seems quite likely that Negro students are more apt to see Negro as opposed to white teachers as understanding their goals and as having a desire to help the student attain goals."[3] In segregated classrooms Negro students may find it easier to discuss Negro problems, much less so than in interracial classrooms.

Gottlieb draws a sharp distinction between an integrated and a merely interracial school. In the former, children of all backgrounds are represented throughout the social system of the school. In the latter, children of different backgrounds coexist. In interracial schools, according to the findings of Project Talent, Negro youth do achieve at higher levels than do Negro youth in segregated schools. On the other hand, the same data reveal that "incidents of school dropout, absenteeism, and delinquency are less likely ... to occur in all-Negro schools within the South."[1] While Gottlieb concludes that segregated schools are inferior to genuinely integrated schools, he also holds that in some respects the southern segregated school is inferior to the merely interracial school.

Brown studied aspiration in rural central Florida.[2] Forty-one matched pairs of Negro and white sixth-grade students were the subjects. Negro children had significantly higher vocational aspirations. While the children as a whole aspired to higher occupations than those held by their fathers, this was true of Negro children to a much greater degree.

Aspirations among Negro and white boys in the Boston area were studied by Meeks.[3] He compared the following groups:

Group	A	20 lower-class Negro boys from Roxbury
	B	18 lower-middle class white boys from South Boston
	C	18 middle class Negro boys from Roxbury
	D	20 middle class white boys from upper-middle class private schools in Boston area.

Aspirational levels were ascertained by student performance on an experimental mechanical testing device. Meeks had expected to find lower class boys with higher aspirations; the reverse turned out to be the case. He predicted Negro boys would have lower aspirations than whites; in fact, it turned out there was no significant difference. On the other hand, he found -- as he had predicted -- that "lower class Negroes will have aspirations which are significantly lower than any other race-class combination."[1] He also predicted with success that "lower-class Negro subjects will have significantly lower aspirations with Negro experimenters than with white experimenters . . . ."[2]

In a real sense, Meeks' study does not belong here as it is not placed in an actual school setting; it is designed as a typical psychological laboratory experiment. On the other hand, its conclusions are, for the most part, sharply at variance with virtually all others in one finding: Meeks fails to find Negro aspirations higher than white aspirations. Unfortunately, the research report contains no acknowledgment of the exceptional nature of this finding. The controls over social class were not very strong in this study; this facilitates highlighting the role of class. In addition, Meeks' theoretical orientation is psychoanalytical. This leads him to conceive of the lower-class Negro as an objectively defeated person who is unable to make the standards of the society's ego ideal--i.e., the white man -- his own. The lower-class Negro is thus regarded as a man without a father. "The defeated attitude with which they [lower class Negroes] approach goal-setting is a result of the ego's yielding to environmental realities and repressing the standards of the ego ideal. They fantasy 'rescue' by neither the socially impotent real father nor the abstract, hostile white model."[1] This explanation suffers from one central failing: It is contradicted by most consequential studies in the field.

Sain studied vocational aspirations among 258 students in a Detroit ghetto school.[2] Occupational preferences and the expectations for the 130 boys were as follows, by percentage:[3]

	Preference	Expectation
Engineer	23.8	17.7
Physician	9.2	6.2
Teacher	6.9	6.2

The scholastic average of the students in this school can be adjudged from the scores on a standard achievement test battery taken by 317 students in grade 10B. On vocabulary, the mean score was more than two years below grade level, and for reading comprehension only a little less than two years. Saind adds that "many students scored on approximately a 4.0 to 5.9 grade level in certain sections of the test."[4]

Odell directed a large-scale survey of the Philadelphia public schools.[5] One part of the report traced the city's 1961 high school graduates and enables a check to be made upon the high educational aspirations of lower-ranked Negro students. Here is a compilation showing Negro and white boys who graduated in 1961, and where they went after graduation:[6]

I Q level group	Went to College	Other School	Armed Forces
White boys			
3rd quarter	13%	7%	16%
4th quarter	3	3	6
Negro boys			
3rd quarter	32	0	28
4th quarter	8	5	23

According to the table, 40 out of every 200 Negro graduates in the lower half of the class, by I Q level, actually entered college; the corresponding figure for white of equivalent I Q scores was 16. This would indicate a greater realism behind high aspirations than might appear at first glance.

St. John studied the relationship of segregation and aspirations.[1] She hypothesized that "the greater the average percent Negro of schools attended in elementary grades one through nine, the lower the educational aspirations of Negro high school students."[2] The hypothesis, however, was not supported by the findings.

Goldberg and Cowan probed certain fantasy behavior related to the achievement role of the Negro male.[3] Negro college girls who were matriarchically oriented, nevertheless were able to conceive of the Negro male as a potential achiever. This view was expressed in the course of the TAT projective tests. "... Although the Negro male may be culturally devaluated," observe the researchers, "in fantasy he is seen as striving toward achievement-related goals."[4] Perhaps, they conclude, this indicates a changing conception of the role of the Negro male.

Cramer, Bowerman, and Campbell studied educational aspirations of southern Negro high school students.[5] Their sample covered Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Virginia. Over 10,000 Negro adolescents completed questionnaries; including follow-up studies, the period covered was November, 1963 - January, 1965. None of the students, apparently, was enrolled in a meaningfully desegregated school. As Wilson had found in Berkeley, so the Cramer group also reported: "... Those with low socioeconomic status may definitely benefit from being in a school environment where college-going is more or less the normal expectation."[1] This was true of the Negro students as well as a white control group.

Huson and Schiltz examined the vocational records of Negro college graduates from Louisiana.[2] Negro students came from Dillard, Grambling, Southern, and Xavier universities. White control students were from Louisiana Polytechnical Institute, Northwestern State, and Tulane University. The major findings of the study were:[3]

1. Negroes are unemployed for longer.

2. Negroes start at lower salaries.

3. Negroes are further behind whites in salary after fifteen months of work than they were to begin with.

4. All but a few Negroes work in substantially Negro environments.

More than half the male Negro graduates became teachers, an occupation to which the above-named findings applied with the greatest force.

Fichter conducted three studies of a national sample of Negro college graduates.[1]

"Lower-income Negroes," according to Fichter, "demonstrate an amazing tenacity in striving for schooling . . . ."[2] Having associated very little with college-oriented people before themselves coming to college, Negro students nonetheless seem to have an especially strong determination to get through college. Compared with white graduates, "the Negroes plan earlier, decide sooner, and are more strongly committed to their career choice."[3] Most enter the field of education as a career. Extremely few prepare for a business career which is regarded by them as the single most racially restricted field.[4]

Fichter, observing a certain self-confidence among the graduates of southern Negro colleges, explained their mood this way:

> This Negro college graduate personally knows large numbers of Negroes who 'didn't make it,' perhaps he has close relatives who were 'left behind' in the struggle for higher education. There is a shorter intergenerational distance between the father who did not finish grade school and who is a laborer, and the son who finishes college to be a professional. More so than the white student, therefore, he has a feeling of accomplishment and of confidence in his own proved ability. The fact is that he has overcome odds, he has fought through successfully, and his self-image may not be quite so unrealistic as it first appears to be.[5]

Another facet of this activist and expansive orientation is the same Negro college student's participation in civil rights activities. Fichter found that Negro college students were seven times likelier to participate in campus civil rights activities than were whites.[1]

Krystall, Chesler, and White made an intensive public opinion study of the Negro community in Montgomery, Alabama.[2] During June, July and November, 1966, interviewers probed attitudes related to desegregation. The researchers found that "approximately sixty-eight percent of the parents felt that the least amount of education their children needed was a college degree. Almost all parents felt sure their children would get it."[3] Only one out of five parents, however, had seriously considered sending their child to an all-white school.[4] At the same time, seven out of ten approved of the principle of Negroes and white attending common schools.[5]

Smith and colleagues explored various aspects of integration in the Detroit area.[6] Samples of Negro and white parents in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties were tested about aspirations for their children's careers. Here is how they responded:[7]

Occupational Field	White	Negro
Professional, technical, and kindred	72%	67%
Other white collar	12	13
Skilled blue collar	6	5
Unskilled blue collar	1	2
Miscellaneous	6	11
Don't know and not available	3	2
N=	383	92

Researchers then ascertained parental perceptions of their children's chances of attaining white collar or blue collar occupations:[1]

Achievement Likelihood	Negro		White	
	White Collar	Blue Collar	White Collar	Blue Collar
Very good	47%	46%	62%	47%
Fairly good	53	41	28	40
Not so good	0	5	3	6
Poor	0	1	0	1
Other	0	7	7	6
N=	15	76	156	224

Smith and his colleagues explain that these rather high aspirations are expected by Negro parents to materialize through an effective school system. Indeed, Negroes expressed very high support for the schools, exceeding by far support expressed by various groups of white adults.[2]

II. Self-Concept of Negro Students

"Other things being equal," wrote Du Bois in 1935, "the mixed school is the broader, more natural basis for the education of all youth. It gives wider contacts; it inspires greater self-confidence; and suppresses the inferiority complex."[3] Today, we might say more simply that in the integrated school, children develop sounder self-concept. What has research shown?

Weddington studied various aspects of racial and class stereotypes among young children.[1] She selected 374 Negro and white children attending three schools in Gary, Indiana. (In 1948, when the children were tested, school segregation was legal in Indiana.) One school was all-Negro, another was all-white, and a third was white but located near a Negro area. Most significant was the researcher's effort to treat class and color as independent contributors to stereotyping. She found, for example, that Negro children assigned favorable traits to whites more frequently than they assigned the same traits to themselves. Usually, this finding was interpreted to signify the self-devaluation of the Negro child. Weddington, however, discovered that this practice was "more a function of the insidious influence of latent class designation than of skin color . . . ."[2] Indeed, color-bias was more evident on the part of the white children. All in all, favorable stereotypes tended to be assigned to persons of high social status --both Negro and white -- while unfavorable stereotypes were assigned -- interracially -- to persons of lower class status.

Trent studied self-acceptance and interracial attitudes.[3] His sample consisted of 202 Negro children, ages 9 to 18, in New York City. He found that "children who were most self-accepting expressed significantly more positive attitudes toward both Negroes and whites than did children who were least self-accepting."[4] No indication was given of the degree of school segregation of the children involved.

Claye made an early study of the effect of desegregation on self-concept in three Arkansas schools. While he designated two schools as segregated and another as integrated, he gave no data as to the cities in which they were located nor the color composition of the non-segregated school. His findings did not support his expectation that the desegregated white students would show a positive growth in self-concept and that they would develop more positive attitudes towards Negroes. Claye noted that the political atmosphere was most unfavorable for measuring interracial attitudes inasmuch as the Little Rock schools crisis occurred at that time.

It may be recalled that both Blake and Geisel, whose work was reviewed above, also discussed the matter of Negro self-esteem. Blake had speculated that "the struggle to maintain self-esteem is much more difficult for Negro students in segregated schools than in integrated schools."[1] Geisel reported that his data contained no evidence that Negroes scored lower on self-concept.[2] Indeed, "Negro mean scores are significantly higher than whites on the evaluative factor of self."[3] And in a striking formulation, Geisel declares: "Who are the Negroes with high self-concept scores? They are aggressive, race conscious, high achievers who epitomize the expression 'Negroes are as good as anyone else.'"[4]

Haggstrom studied self-esteem and desegregation in Detroit and Ypsilanti.[5] His sample consisted of a total of 120 Negro households in both cities. By self-esteem, he meant "self-perception of the degree to which the basic values and aspirations are realized."[6] His central finding was that desegregated Negroes have higher self-esteem than do segregated Negroes. Haggstrom tentatively concluded that this was so "because the Negro community as a symbol of inferiority depresses the self-esteem of its members."[7] The Negro community, according to Haggstrom, is a white-created symbol of "permanent social inferiority" flying in the face of a social value of equality. In the ghetto, exaggerated perceptions of whites develop, and persistent social failure there leads to further identification of Negro [of self] with failure.

Desegregated Negroes are more rejecting of the color line and more accepting of both white and Negro people. Segregated Negroes, on the other hand, tend to live within the color line and are less accepting of whites. Haggstrom found that "desegregated families more often and to a greater extent help children consciously work through problems of their feelings about racial differences."[1] In segregated milieux, racial "incidents" are, by definition, rare, and thus seldom become a topic of conversation. In interracial neighborhoods, however, it is common for desegregated Negro parents "to help their young children accept the difference in skin color and understand that they need not feel less worthy because of it. The greater number of incidents in white neighborhoods serve as occasions which lead parents explicitly to express love and esteem to their children as Negro children."[2] Desegregated Negro children are thus doubly the beneficiaries of desegregation: their parents have greater self-esteem and they themselves are more accepted for what they are and thus have a broader basis for their own self-esteem.

Haggstrom closes with a frankly speculative comment: "My guess is that Negroes of high achievement in adult life tend disproportionately either to have had desegregated childhoods or to have been children in households the adult members of which have been desegregated during childhood."[3]

Stinson studied the effect of desegregation upon basic intergroup attitudes.[4] A sample of 833 Negro and white students in 13 schools located in a large southern city was tested in September, 1962, and February, 1963. His findings: "Positive perceptions of others' self-acceptance increased for the desegregated group while perceptions of the segregated group on the same variable decreased. There was greater similarily in the perceptions of Negro and white students than in the perceptions of segregated and desegregated students."[1] Virtually no indication is given of what concrete classroom experiences might have produced these results.

Maliver explored anti-Negro bias among Negro college students.[2] He predicted that low scorers -- i.e., with little such bias -- would tend to identify more positively with their parents and themselves, and would tend to resist actively any attack upon themselves All hypotheses had to be rejected in view of the findings. As Maliver concluded: "It is difficult to draw theoretical implications since the major hypotheses of the study were rejected."[3]

Derbyshire studied personal identity among Negro students at Morgan State College in Baltimore.[4] He found a pervasive sense of identity conflict among the subjects, especially as concerned color. Those students most secure over their identity as Negroes were also most likely to accept other minorities.[5] Students who were unsure of their identity as Negroes tended to define their relation to others in negativistic terms: We are not sure of anything but that we don't want to be like you. Students who were more certain of their identity tended to define the Negro role in terms of sharing certain humanistic goals.

Baehr studied the relation of "southern" dialect to need achievement among students in Crane High School, a virtually all-Negro school in Chicago.[1] He found that boys with the greatest need to achieve tended to minimize southern dialect in those situations approximating competitive relations in the larger society. They did not, however, suppress or moderate the dialect in other kinds of situations. These findings are reported in this section because they indicate that a Negro can change certain aspects of his "Negro-ness" with no apparent injury to his self-concept.

In the Dumbarton study of Oakland, California, discussed earlier, it was observed that there was no significant difference between the self-concept of segregated and desegregated Negro students.[2]

Meketon studied the impact of desegregation upon the self-esteem of Negro children.[3] Eighty-nine fifth and sixth grade Negro students were located in three schools, as follows:

School	Total Enrollment	% Negro	Number of Negroes in Sample	Location
School A	821	100	29	Norwich
School B	416	30	29	Norwich
School C	586	22	31	Burwyn

Students were matched comprehensively; a control group for children in School A was also matched. It is important to note that schools B and C had desegregated under very different circumstances. In B, desegregation had been installed on administrative initiative; no demonstrations or public pressure had come from the organized Negro community. In C, however, desegregation had come as a direct consequence of prolonged and bitter public controversy, involving debates and demonstrations by the Negro community. School A, of course, was still segregated, as shown above.

Two principal hypotheses were entertained:[1]

> 1. The Negro child's performance will be adversely affected by the process of school integration . . . .
>
> 2. . . . Forced competition with a group considered to be "superior" will affect the child's feelings of self-esteem in a negative fashion.

The findings contradicted both hypotheses. The predicted significant differences did not appear in the data. Various other hypotheses and subhypotheses fared differently.

As between School A and School B, children at the former -- segregated - school scored significantly higher on the Self Subtest, a partial test of self-esteem. On the other hand, Negro children at the peacefully desegregated School B did not have significantly higher self-esteem scores [illegible] children at the tumultuously desegregated School C. Indeed, children at the latter school had significantly higher self-esteem scores than children at School A. Teachers at all three schools were asked to make certain judgments about the children: "... School C teachers evaluated their students as possessiong higher levels of self-esteem than did either of the other two schools, and in School A and B, teachers found more evidence of defensive behavior than did teachers in School C."[2]

Why did Negro students at School C hold up so well? Meketon suggests that the explanation lies with the salience of family and home for these particular children. Among the factors contributing to the high morale of School C children were:[3]

> [T]he support and sympathy of a close-knit Negro community, national encouragement represented by legal counsel from NAACP, and Supreme Court decisions. Negro community morale, together with the obvious fact that integration had been accomplished to a larger extent on their own [parents'] terms, must have served as a source of encouragement to the children. Victories for Negroes in their exchanges with whites are infrequent.

Several Negro teachers worked in School C and they proved a valued refuge for the desegregated Negro children. In School B, on the other hand, the entire community support aspect was absent. Also, not a single Negro teacher worked in School B.

Student anxiety, which Meketon had originally thought would undo the desegregated child, did not have this consequence: "The child," observed Meketon, "is remarkably adaptable and flexible, and given the right circumstances can overcome many of the detrimental aspects of integration."[1] Parental support, she adds, is crucial: "Parental understanding and consideration when the child fails scholastically in his competition with his white peers or meets with rebuffs will help counteract the child's feelings of guilt and inferiority."[2]

The Meketon study is a surprisingly close affirmation of the work of clinician Robert Coles.[3]

Singer compared white and Negro fifth graders to discover the effect of segregation and desegretation on interracial attitudes.[4] Her general hypothesis follows:[5]

> A differentiated cognitive structure (the ability to maintain several attitudes and opinions simultaneously concerning another individual who is a memb. . of the outgroup) and more positive attitudes, as a function of proximity and intelligence, should be found for children in the integrated school concerning their attitudes towards Negroes, when compared to the less

> differentiated perceptions and less positive attitudes towards Negroes held by the white child in a school where there is no contact with Negroes.

Three schools were selected for the test: (1) a High Exposure School (HES), whose fifth-grade student body was 60 percent white and in which extensive interracial contact was evident; (2) two Low Exposure Schools (LES), one of whose fifth-grade student body was all-white, and the other whose fifth-grade enrollment was 15 percent white. While I Q scores were similar for both schools, the white students were primarily middle class, the Negroes lower income.

The white children in HES consistently scored lower on social distance toward Negroes. In accounting for white desire to have social contact with Negroes, Singer found exposure to be more important than either intelligence or sex. Unexpectedly, it did not appear that the brighter children were less prejudiced. Girls were, in general, less prejudiced than boys.

If Negro exposure to whites led to less anti-white prejudice, how did it affect Negro self-conception? Singer administered certain drawing tests to all children. Twenty-four Negro children colored the face of a figure supposed to be a self-portrait; not a single white child did so. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that 18 of the 24 were in HES. "In other words," observed Singer, "the Negro children who had greater contact with white children showed a tendency to differentiate themselves and assert their identity more clearly."[1]

Generally speaking, Negro children in HES had less regard for whites as academic achievers than did Negro children in LES. As Singer comments: "the segregated Negro may see the white world as one of success and his own world as one of failure . . . ."[2] (This observation is supported by the research of Blake and Haggstrom; Meketon's work is also relevant.) The bright Negro girl in HES "can conceive of herself as achieving more than a white child, and turns to her own group rather than to whites for socialization."[1] Under integration, then, the Negro child is able "to differentiate himself without anxiety."[2] On the other hand, Negro children in the LES "were less accepting of their skin color, saw themselves as poor achievers, and developed negative attitudes towards various non-white groups."[3]

Children were not merely "exposed" to one another; they had to do with each other. True, white children usually rated Negro children as "race" on tests; but this was fact, not prejudice. Despite this awareness, white children in HES still were more willing to associate with Negroes than were white children in LES. These latter white children, in fact, tended on tests to deny the existence of Negro aggression. As Singer notes: "Whites with no contact perceived the Negro in a distorted manner, giving him intellectual credit, but refusing to associate with him."[4]

Morland compared race awareness in Boston and Lynchburg, Virginia.[5] He matched four groups of forty-one Negro and white children, age 3 - 6. A majority in each group preferred whites over Negroes. White self-identification exceeded Negro self-identification. The white model was especially strong among southern children: southern whites were more race-conscious than northern whites, and southern Negroes were significantly more likely to prefer whites.[6] Morland holds that "preference for one race ... did not mean rejection of the other race, for the great majority in the four groupings accepted members of both races when no choice was required . . . ."[1] He acknowledges that this interpretation is at odds with previous studies.[2]

Fundamentally, observes Morland, America is racist although it need not remain so:[3]

> . . . American society as it now operates teaches that racial differences are very important and that being white is preferable to being Negro. Under such conditions young Negro children probably unconsciously learn to prefer and identify with the dominant race . . . . The results of this study on race awareness in young children suggest that as the sociocultural milieu in America changes, such awareness will change.

Which -- Negro or white -- would change first Morland did not say.

An indication that the change is occurring first among Negro parents and children can be seen in recent statistics regarding sales of "Negro-colored" dolls. Around Christmas, 1967, a Harlem department store was selling five Negro dolls for every white one, more than usual. According to Daniel M. O'Connell, manager of a national doll manufacturing firm, Negro doll sales increased by forty percent in 1965-1967. Edwin Nelson, Jr., president of another company, stated about Negro dolls: "Originally they were most acceptable in Negro metropolitan markets. Now they are selling equally well in the South. Because of the civil rights movement, Negroes have developed a pride in themselves and their race and prefer to have children identify with their own race."[4] Harry C. Coards, president of a large toy firm, reported plans to integrate the wood people in its toys. (Although not mentioned by this industry survey, another possible explanation of the boom in Negro dolls is the large number of research projects on Negro self-concept which require Negro dolls for experimental use!)

Negro and white personality differences were studied by Frenkel.[1] One hundred fifty-three matched pairs were drawn from Oklahoma State University in Stillwater and Oakwood College, Huntsville, Alabama. The Negro sample had considerably higher mean socioeconomic status scores than the whites (55.8 vs. 37.5). On the tests, whites were found to have significantly higher anxiety scores; Frenkel had predicted the reverse. Negroes had higher social acquiescence scores. No racial differences were found on measures of ego-strength or aggression. Frenkel was expecially interested in lower Negro anxiety and explained it by noting that the Negroes attended an all-Negro school where "lack of competition with whites and lower need-achievement might result in lower anxiety."[2] He was struck most by the relative absence of racial differences on the personality measured. He was confident that such differences did exist in the past. There was reason to believe that such differences were diminishing. "Since an era of integration arises," Frenkel speculated, "Negroes met with fewer frustrating situations and hence they have less need for aggressive behavior. Instead, they have a strong need to be accepted by society at large."[3]

Long and Henderson studied self-concept among children in a rural southern community.[4] Seventy-two Negro and 72 white children, about to enter first grade, were tested. The white children, treated as a control group, differed significantly from the Negro group in I Q, father's occupation, kindergarten experience, and other respects. Long and Henderson found that the Negro children had "a lower self-esteem ($p = .05$) and with teacher ($p = $ about $.05$)."[1] Significant differences on some of these variables were present within the Negro group. The researchers conclude that "for the Negro child, a realistic acceptance of the self as 'dark' may be one aspect of and possibly a prerequisite for an adequate self-esteem and a good relationship with peers."[2] The precise reasoning that led to this conclusion is somewhat unclear.

Garth studied self-concepts of Negro students in Louisville.[3] Forty-four Negro students who transferred to a heretofore all-white junior high school were compared with fifty Negro students who chose to remain in an all-Negro school. Transferees had higher I Q scores and grade point averages though both groups were comparable in socioeconomic status. (The higher I Q scores for transferees were accounted for by girls' scores; the boys did not show this difference.)

Transferees tended to be less favorable in self-concepts and were more severe in self-criticism. Garth states that the transferees "consistently describe 'Integrated High Schools' and 'White People' relatively favorably on the evaluative dimension and they score 'Negroes I Know' and 'Lower Class People' as relatively impotent."[4]

Self-concept among four-year-old children was studied by Brown.[1] Thirty-eight lower social status Negro and Puerto Rican children were compared with 36 upper middle class white children over a three-week interval. In general, all the children showed highly positive self-conceptions. However, the Negro children on "Self as subject" tended to conceive of themselves as:[2]

a. sad rather than happy

b. stupid rather than smart

c. sickly as distinguished from healthy

d. not liking their own facial appearance as opposed to evaluating their facial appearance favorably.

Brown cautioned that his project was a pilot study for a larger undertaking and its findings should therefore be regarded as tentative.

In Lockwood's study of 6th graders in upstate New York, no significant self-esteem difference was found between children in racially balanced and imbalanced schools. One exception, however, is enlightening: "For the item 'I'm pretty happy', 76 percent of the students in the imbalanced schools responded with 'like me' and 90 percent of the students in balanced schools responded with similarity. Conversely, 19 percent of the students in imbalanced schools and only 7 percent in the balanced school responded with 'unlike me'."[1]

Clark and associates investigated self-concept among pre-school children.[2] Ninety-five Negro and 52 white children were compared with respect to self-concept and vocabulary. While vocabulary scores of white boys were significantly higher than those of Negro boys, no significant differences were found in the area of self-concept. (A general finding of overall high self-concept repeated Brown's finding.) Clark and associates warn: "... The repeated emphasis on the 'negative self-image' of Negro pre-school children in educational literature may need tempering lest it receive a spurious validation in the pre-school classroom by becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy."[3]

In Jonsson's study of Berkeley, discussed earlier, it will be recalled that he compared three groups of children: (1) Target children: enrolled in schools in poverty areas of the city; (2) Bused children: who had been enrolled in target schools but were bused to non-target schools, mainly middle-class white; and (3) Non-target: as just described; some served as receiving schools for the bused children. Jonsson first compared Target with non-Target children and found that the former were higher and that they "differentiated their responses less from item to item."[4] The implication is that Target children were somewhat rigidly defensive in their self-conception.

Bused children, only 13 in number, responded very differently:[1]

> ... They differentiated their responses from item to item much more than did the pupils of the target school, and showed no tendency to have a positive response set. ... An equally marked difference is in the number of negative item averages for bused pupils... . The bused children consistently rated themselves less positively on achievement-related items than did the target pupils and, fairly consistently, a little lower than did the non-target group.

It will be recalled that Jonsson earlier reported that the bused students' academic gains, while modest, exceeded expectations.

It may be of some interest to examine the relationship of race consciousness and attitude toward persons of another race from an adult perspective. Noel studied this relationship using 515 adult Negroes as his subjects.[2] With reference to ethnic identification, the subjects were divided into two classifications: (1) Identifiers, or those who had a positive identification with Negroes as a group, and (2) Disparagers, or those who had a negative identification. Noel found that "Negroes who are militantly identified with the minority group are consistently more favorably inclined toward integration, both in attitude and action, than are Negroes who disparage the in-group."[3] In other words, those who felt most Negro were likely to be least anti-white. Ethnic consciousness need not necessarily become ethnocentrism.

Noel explored the relationship of ethnic identification to "defensive insulation." Respondents who accepted the following proposition were classed as believers in defensive insulation: "It is best to stay away from white people; then you will avoid all embarrassing situations."

Table 3 reports the data:

Table 3.

Ethnic Identification and Defensive Insulation

Believe in Defensive Insulation	(N = 229) Identifiers	(N = 180) Ambivalents	(N = 106) Disparagers
Yes	16%	28%	56%
No	84	72	44

This highly significant difference (beyond the .001 level) points up the socially constructive function of ethnic consciousness. What Noel calls "positive group identification"[1] is precisely what Singer described as Negro children "differentiating themselves."

III. Conclusions

We have seen that aspirations are products of much up-and-back between the individual and his fellowmen. Also, it is clear that while the highest aspirations can and do arise from the meanest circumstances,

they often lead to little. Just how realistic these aspirations are
less pressing a question than is ordinarily thought. Nobody has yet demonstrated a greater Negro propensity toward fantasy.

How might we summarize the principal implications of the researc reviewed in this chapter ?

1. Negro students' aspirations are as high and often higher than those of white students.
2. If realism is defined by its correspondence with the status quo, then Negro youth in college are highly realistic aspirants.
3. The social climate of the school constitutes an autonomous influence upon aspirations.
4. If the community as a whole were to raise its aspirations for the low-status student, including the Negro, there would probably be an enormous educational stride forward.
5. To disentangle the separate effects of race and class upon self-concept is extremely difficult.
6. Desegregation has most often benefited the Negro child's self-esteem and virtually never has harmed it.
7. Historical factors such as the civil rights movement are critical in raising self-esteem of Negro children.

8. Desegregation has facilitated Negro acceptance of color as a constructive factor, while heightening Negro willingness to live and learn with whites.

Let us now turn to studies that examine the day-to-day interplay of student-and-student and student-and-teacher.

FOOTNOTES

Page 65

1. James S. Coleman, Race Relations and Social Change (Baltimore, Md.: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967), p. 31.

2. David P. and Pearl Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in Harry A. Passow (ed.), Education in Depressed Areas (N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), p. 118.

3. See, for example, Thomas F. Pettigrew, A Profile of the Negro American (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 184.

Page 66

1. Rayford W. Logan, "Educational Segregation in the North," Journal of Negro Education (January, 1933), p. 65.

2. See, for example, Suzanne Keller and Marisa Zavalloni, "Ambition and Social Class: A Respecification," Social Forces, October, 1964.

3. G. F. Boyd, "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVI, 1952. An indication that the situation in Portland was unchanged some twelve years later is in Committee on Race and Education, Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools (Portland: Board of Education, October 29, 1964), p. 122.

4. Charles B. Nam, A. Lewis Rhodes, and Robert E. Herriott, Inequalities in Educational Opportunities. A Demographic Analysis of Educational Differences in the Population (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, May, 1966), p. 57.

Page 67

1. Elias Blake, Jr., A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, University of Illinois, 1960. University Microfilm No. 60-1616.

2. Ibid., pp. 27-28.

Page 68

1. Ibid., p. 69.

2. Ibid., p. 71.

3. Alan B. Wilson, The Effect of Residential Segregation Upon Educational Achievement and Aspirations, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1960. See, also, Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, December, 1959.

Page 69

1. Ibid., p. 19.

2. Ibid., p. 49.

Page 70

1. Ibid., p. 67.

2. Ibid., p. 99.

3. Ibid., p. 68.

Page 71

1. Paul N. Geisel, I Q Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Vanderbilt University, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-1838.

2. Ibid., pp. 64-5.

3. Ibid., p. 169.

4. Ibid., p. 283.

5. Ibid., p. 211.

Page 72

1. Ibid., p. 280.

2. James G. Maddox with E. E. Biebhafsky, Vivian W. Henderson, and Herbert M. Hamlin, The Advancing South. Manpower Prospects and Problems (N.Y.: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967), pp. 144-145.

3. Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in An Integrated University, p. 47.

4. Geisel, p. 284.

5. Harold S. Goldblatt and Cyril Tyson, *Some Self Perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro, and White Pupils in 4th, 5th, and 6th Grades*, Research Report No. 12 (N. Y.: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962).

Page 73

1. Christus N. Powell, *Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama,* unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963. University Microfilm No. 64-5382.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

Page 74

1. *Ibid.*, p. 89.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

3. Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," *Social Forces*, October, 1963.

4. Geisel, p. 279.

5. Gist and Bennett, p. 44.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

7. Geisel, p. 210.

8. David Gottlieb, "Goal Aspirations and Goal Fulfillments: Differences Between Deprived and Affluent American Adolescents," unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 19, 1964. See, also, Gottlieb, "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class. But It's Not East," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* October, 1967.

Page 75

1. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

3. Ibid.

Page 76

1. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

2. Robert G. Brown, "A Comparison of the Vocational Aspirations of Paired Sixth-Grade White and Negro Children Who Attend Segregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research*, May-June, 1965.

3. Donald E. Meeks, *Race, Social Class, and Level of Aspiration: The Effects of Race and Social Class on the Goal-Striving Behavior of White and Negro Boys*, unpublished D.S.W. dissertation, Smith College, 1965. University Microfilms No. 66-907.

Page 77

1. *Ibid.*, p. 56.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Page 78

1. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

2. Leonard F. Sain, *Occupational Preferences and Expectations of Negro Students Attending a High School Located in a Lower Socio-Economic Area*, unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University. 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-10, 119.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 112.

4. *Ibid.*, footnote 2, p. 172.

5. William R. Odell, *Educational Survey Report for the Philadelphia Board of Public Education*. Philadelphia: Board of Public Education, February 1, 1965.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 169.

Page 79

1. Nancy Hoyt St. John, "The Effect of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer, 1966.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

3. Faye J. Goldberg and Gloria Cowan, "Achievement Motivation and Fantasy Production as a Function of the Race and Sex of the TAT Figures," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans. March 31, 1966.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

5. M. Richard Cramer. Charles E. Bowerman, and Ernest Q. Campbell, *Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents*, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina. 1966).

Page 80

1. Ibid., II, p. 350.

2. Carolyn F. Huson and Michael E. Schiltz, College, Color, and Employment. Racial Differentials in Postgraduate Employment Among 1964 Graduates of Louisiana Colleges (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, July, 1966).

3. Ibid., p. XIX.

Page 81

1. Joseph H. Fichter: Young Negro Talent--Survey of the Experiences and Expectations of Negro Americans Who Graduated from College in 1961 (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1964); Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Experiences and Expectations of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961 (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1965); and Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, Class of 1964 (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

2. Fichter, Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, p. 52.

3. Ibid., p. 154.

4. Fichter, Young Negro Talent, pp. 37 and 54. See, also, Andrew F. Brimmer, "Employment Patterns and the Dilemma of Desegregation," Integrated Education, October - November, 1967.

5. Fichter, Young Negro Talent, p. 62.

Page 82

1. Fichter, Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, p. 211.

2. Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes (Tuskegee, Alabama: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March, 1967).

3. Ibid., p. 29.

4. Ibid., p. 34.

5. Ibid., p. 38.

6. Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashshur, and Gary W. Shannon, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967).

7. Ibid., p. 50.

Page 83

1. Ibid., p. 51.

2. On specific school policies, however, considerable controversy exists. See, for example, National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Detroit, Michigan. A Study of Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunity in a Large City (Wash., D.C.: National Educational Association, March, 1967) and Karl D. Gregory, "The Walkout: Symptom of Dying Inner City Schools," New University Thought, Spring, 1967.

3. William E. B. Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" Journal of Negro Education, July, 1935, p. 335.

Page 84

1. Rachel T. Weddington, The Relative Influence of Social Class and Color on the Stereotypes of Young Children, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1958.

2. Ibid., p. 54.

3. Richard D. Trent, "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, September, 1957.

4. Ibid., p. 30.

Page 85

1. Blake, A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration, p. 69.

2. Geisel, I Q Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City, p. 91.

3. Ibid., p. 277.

4. Ibid., p. 282.

5. Warren C. Haggstrom, Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-359; also, Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," Integrated Education, October - November, 1963.

6. Ibid., p. 84.

7. Ibid., p. 160.

Page 86

1. Ibid., p. 157.

2. Ibid., p. 158. (emphasis in original).

3. Ibid., p. 172.

4. Harold N. Stinson, The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963. University Microfilm No. 64-5089.

Page 87

1. Ibid., p. 79.

2. Bruce L. Maliver, Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Psychology, Yeshiva University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-10,006.

3. Ibid., p. 121.

4. Robert L. Derbyshire, Personal Identity: An Attitude Study of American Negro College Students, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Maryland, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-11,098.

5. Ibid., p. 259.

Page 88

1. Rufus F. Baehr, Need Achievement and Dialect in Lower-Class Adolescent Negroes, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1964. See, also, Baehr, " 'Negro Dialect' and the Motive to Achieve," Integrated Education, February - March, 1966.

2. Race and Education in the City of Oakland, p. 141.

3. Betty F. Meketon, The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966.

Page 89

1. Ibid., pp. 1-2.

2. Ibid., pp. 67-68.

3. Ibid., p. 79.

Page 90

1. Ibid., p. 90.

2. Ibid., p. 91.

3. See Robert Coles, Children of Crisis. A Study of Courage and Fear (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), passim.

4. Dorothy G. Singer, Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1960. University Microfilm No. 67-2836. See, also, Singer, "Reading, Writing, and Race Relations," Trans-Action, June, 1967.

5. Ibid., p. 19.

Page 91

1. Ibid., pp. 99-101.

2. Ibid., p. 105.

Page 92

1. Ibid., p. 108.

2. Ibid., p. 109.

3. Ibid., pp. 113-114.

4. Ibid., p. 114.

5. J. Kenneth Morland, "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1966; see, also, by Morland: "Racial Recognition in Nursery School Children in Lynchburg, Virginia," Social Forces, December, 1958; "Racial Acceptance and Preference of Nursery School Children in a Southern City," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VIII (1962); "Racial Self-Identification: A Study of Nursery School Children," American Catholic Sociological Review, Fall, 1963; and "The Development of Racial Bais in Young Children," Theory Into Practice, II (1963).

6. Ibid., p. 29.

Page 93

1. Ibid., p. 26.

2. See, especially, by Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie Clark: (1) "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children," Journal of Social Psychology, November, 1939; (2) "Segregation as a Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children, a Preliminary Report," Journal of Experimental Education, December, 1939.

3. Ibid., p. 29.

4. Associated Press story, Chicago Sun-Times, December 14, 1967.

Page 94

1. Sinai Israel Frenkel, A Comparison Between Negro and White College Students on Several Personality Measures, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966.

2. Ibid., p. 69.

3. Ibid., pp. 70-71.

4. Barbara H. Long and Edmund H. Henderson, "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September, 1966.

Page 95

1. Ibid., p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. Charles E. Garth, Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Kentucky, 1963.

4. Ibid., p. 132.

Page 96

1. Bert R. Brown, The Assessment of Self-Concept Among Four-Year-Old Negro and White Children: A Comparative Study Using the Brown-IDS Self Concept Referents Test (N.Y.: Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966).

2. Ibid., p. 26.

Page 97

1. Jane D. Lockwood, An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home-Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966, p. 53. University Microfilm No. 67-8303.

2. Edward T. Clark, Richard J. Ozenhosky, Anita I. Barz, and John V. O'Leary, "Self-Concept and Vocabulary Development in Negro and White Pre-School Children," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, April, 1967.

3. Ibid., p. 5.

4. Jonsson, Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I, p. 46.

Page 98

1. Ibid., pp. 54-55.

2. Donald L. Noel, "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration," unpublished Paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

3. Ibid., p. 5.

Page 99

1. See, also, Gary T. Marx, Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 196-197, on self-image and out-group hostility.

CHAPTER IV

THE STUDENT IN SCHOOL AND IN THE FAMILY

In this chapter are explored four different aspects of desegregation: (1) How do students of one race relate to students of another race? (2) What are the relations of minority student and teacher? (3) How does the family influence the desegregated school situation? and (4) How might the major desegregation effects discussed in chapters two, three, and the present one be seen from the viewpoint of social psychological theory?

1. The Student and Other Students

Criswell studied interracial attitudes of Negro and white elementary school children in New York City; they attended three non-segregated schools.[1] In the earliest grades, there was little mutual withdrawal because of race; the most popular children of the majority interrelate with children of the minority. By the fifth grade, both phenomena change. Consistently, white children show more group self-preference. In the intermediate grades, Negro children sense the exclusion. As Criswell points out:

> There was no distinct evidence that these white and Negro children of nearly the same socio-economic status, were fundamentally less congenial with seatmates chosen from the other race. The situation is most simply viewed as one in which the whites show primary self-preference, a growing sense of racial kinship dependent on community attitudes, while Negroes develop a secondary preference dependent on the increasing withdrawal of the whites and on the Negroes' keener sensitivity to this withdrawal.[2]

The character of white friendships with Negro children varied with the color composition of the classroom. In a predominantly white classroom, white children have a larger element of choice as to whether or not to strike up a friendship with a Negro classmate; thus they can choose more spontaneously, and the result is a more intimate relationship. In predominantly Negro classrooms, however, the choice is a narrower one, and thus the resulting relationship is less spontaneous and intimate.

Over a quarter-century ago, Boone studied the life of Negro students at the University of Michigan. Bitterly, he concluded:

> . . . The Negro student in attending a white school may expect to find the denial of unlimited opportunity, the occurrence of social embarrassments, and the concrete proof that American democracy is the white man's democracy -- just as he has already experienced in everyday life.[1]

This indictment highlights at least two crucial questions to be asked about student relations under desegregation: (1) are these relations such as to encourage the minority student to transform opportunity into actual achievement, and (2) what is the quality of everyday human contacts in the school?

The Williams-Ryan 1954 study reported of the few Negro students in desegregated schools: "... They tended to keep themselves apart unless sought out for the more informal activities connected with school or for social occasions .... What evidence there is points to an impersonal friendliness in school and school related activities, along with some withdrawal to like groups after school."[2] Researchers for the American Political Science Association interviewed five Negro students in each of 23 predominantly white colleges.[3] Respondents reported that they attended all school events as well as informal and social affairs. "As to more subtle matters, the Negro students interviewed in most instances believed that they were not accepted on their individual merit either by the administration or the general student body .... The Negro student at a predominantly white college continues to feel that he is thought of as different, or as an outsider."

The attitudes of white ninth and tenth graders toward Negroes were measured before and seven months after desegregation. No change in attitudes resulted; classroom contact with Negroes seemed without consequence. The researcher did find that white prejudice against Negroes increased as white scholastic averages fell.[1] In a study in the Washington, D. C., area, Dunn found "high authoritarian tendencies are prone to be accompanied by unfavorable attitudes toward integrated [desegregated] schools and vice versa."[2] Somewhat contrarily, another researcher found white student attitudes toward Negroes were not related to self-concept.[3] Dwyer reported that informal associations thrived among younger children and increased with time.[4] In a Southern California school, Negroes and Spanish-speaking students participated very little; ability grouping added to the social distance separating Negroes from whites.[5]

Webster studied the effects of interracial contacts upon interracial attitudes.[6] He selected a sample of 60 white students and 44 Negro students in a Richmond, California junior high school. Parents of two groups of children varied widely in terms of occupations and educational attainment. Control groups of children were chosen in schools where no interracial contact was possible; the Negro parents came predominantly from the South. After six months of contact, the

Negro students had become more socially accepting of whites than whites were of Negroes; Webster had predicted this. On the other hand, he also found that white students who had experienced interracial contact had become, after six months, less accepting than were the white control students who had not experienced any interracial contact. How could this anomalous finding be explained?

Webster noted that he had been unable to pre-test the white control students. There is thus some question whether a strict comparison could be made between white control and experimental group changes over the six-month period. Webster noted four specific factors in the local scene that were unfavorable to friendly interracial contacts: (1) physical aggression had marked the beginning of desegregation; (2) Negroes resented the obvious avoidance-behavior of white classmates; (3) white students held stereotyped conceptions about Negroes; and (4) parental support was expressed for on-going tendencies and did not encourage friendship. Webster concluded that (1) contact of itself is insufficient without adult guidance; (2) the initial conflict between Negro and white was never overcome and was allowed to stand in the way of improvement; (3) without a broad community program of positive acceptance, interracial classroom behavior cannot be changed in fundamental ways; and (4) six months may be too short a time in which to develop constructive interracial attitudes.

In commenting upon Webster's study, Haggstrom interprets the weight of relevant research as indicating that "Negro children benefit in a number of ways from direct comparison and competition with white children regardless of the attitudes of children toward them . . . ."[1]

Thomas, the principal of a Chicago upper middle-class private school, discussed the procedures whereby a small number of Negro children are incorporated within the routines of the school. Negro children are encouraged by the presence of some Negro teachers. Racial intermarriage is a widespread concern among white parents and the school takes special pains to make this point to students. In 1947, when the decision to desegregate was made, a school discussion of intermarriage "brought general agreement that at an early age boys and girls should realize that they go to school with many people whom they value as friends and associates but whom they had best not consider as potential mates."[2] Thomas reported further: "For some time Negroes have testified that going to the school with a white majority has taught them to face reality. For instance, they realize that mixed dating is not widely accepted."[3]

Lee studied race relations in a Connecticut town of 10,000 people, located ten miles from a city of 125,000.[4] "The school system is the freest area of behavior for Negroes," states Lee.[5] Inside the high school, there are many interracial best-friend relationships. For most of the town's Negro youth who live in a concentrated area, the interior of a white house is an unknown quantity; very few white youths ever visit a Negro fellow student. With regard, however, to Negroes and whites who live near one another, "they see much more of each other [and] visit more often and intimately . . . ."[1]

Berlin, a psychiatrist who had served as a consultant to the San Francisco school system, explained the occurrence of discipline problems among Negro youth who were placed in heretofore all-white schools: "They want very much to become accepted in the new setting and yet they feel so hopelessly behind the other youngsters that they begin, almost inevitably, to resort to the only behavior they have learned to use to cope with such distressing feelings."[2] This aspect of desegregation was presented as though it were typical. The only other statement of a similar view is by Vredevoe.[3] His statements, however, cannot be checked for the specific instances are not identified nor is the source of any fact given.

Herriott and St. John give a more balanced report and probably more broadly based view when they report a significant but not overwhelming discipline problem in lower socioeconomic schools.[4]

In the Clark-Plotkin study of Negro college students, discussed in the preceding chapter, students did report considerable integration in classroom and extra-curriculum. Nevertheless, the researchers note an "undercurrent theme of racial discrimination."[5]

St. John studied interracial association in a de facto segregated New England high school.[6] The researcher found, contrary to expectations, that Negroes were not less active than whites, that Negroes held more offices than did whites, and that there was no relationship between a Negro student's attendance at a segregated elementary school and his interracial contacts in high school. On the other hand, a strong negative relationship was found to exist between the interracial associations of Negro high school students and the average percent of Negro children who had attended their elementary school. It was found that white children more often chose northern Negro children as friends than they did children who had grown up in the South. Also, white students were found readier than Negroes to initiate a personal friendship. The desegregated situation studied by the researcher had existed for eighteen months.

The first two Negro graduates of the University of Georgia experienced, at best, indifference, and, at worst, isolation. During his two and a half years at the university, Hamilton Holmes "had never eaten in a university dining hall, studied in the library, used the gymnasium, or entered the snack bar. No white student had ever visited him, and he had never visited one of them."[1] His classmate Charlayne Hunter received many letters of encouragement to tell her she was not really alone. "But," commented Miss Hunter, "I look all around and I don't see anybody else."

Negro-white intelligence disparities constitute one of the outstanding issues of contention in this area of interest. Some argue that the disparities are racial and constitute a reasonable bar to desegregation; this viewpoint is explored further in Chapter VIII. Others contend that the disparities are primarily environmental in origin and can be overcome with a carefully constructed classroom regimen. Both views,

3

however, often accept the scientific validity of the I Q score. Lusienski noted that Negro I Q scores on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) have come from southern Negro children. Is it justified to assume that they are also representative of northern Negro children? To answer this question, he tested a large population of lower-class northern Negro (and white) boys living in Boys Town, Nebraska.[1]

Lusienski found no significant differences on the Full Scale WISC I Q. He did observe an interesting variation: "There was some tendency ... for the Negro sample to excel on those tests calling for maturity or experience, while the whites reflected similar advantage on cultural and scholastic background."[2] Racists were warned by Lusienski that they could not find any comfort in his findings. Referring to the close similarities of Negro and white scores, he concluded: "The likenesses are the more striking when the Negro group's scores are measured against those of others of their race who have been described in previous WISC investigation. Drawn from southern populations, they had almost nothing in common with the Boys Town colored boys."[3]

Bradley studied close school friendships held by Negro high school and college students in Baltimore.[4] "More than twice as many of the college group and three times as many of the secondary school group indicated that their closest friend, ranked as number one, was a Negro, ... [than] indicated that their closest friend similarly ranked, was white." Desegregation was held to have encouraged interracial friendships.

Bindman regarded student relations as a central subject of his inquiry at the University of Illinois. The Negro student, according to Bindman, "feels isolated, alienated, and disaffected from the University system."[1] Few white students initiated any close personal relationships with Negro students and the campus normative structure directed interracial activities into the more impersonal realm of campus life. Here, equality reigned -- until it hurt. The overwhelming impersonality of the campus struck Negro students hardest. Not a single Negro belonged to a white fraternity where informal information and academic assistance could have been obtained by Negroes. Instead, the campus Negro group "is made up of peers with the same paucity of information, and knowledge, particularly about the formal system."[2] They don't know their way around.

Jonsson's study of Berkeley discovered that the busing program had strongly stimulated social integration. Mothers of bused children and of children in the receiving schools reported a significantly greater number of interracial friendships than did mothers of other children.[3] Teachers verified these trends which eventuated despite considerable apprehension by the children: "... 24 of the 30 bused children interviewed stated ... that the receiving school children were 'friendlier' than expected."[4] In two respects, the impact of busing must have been restrained: (1) the bused Negro children were of a higher social status than the remainder of the children in the sending schools and thus did not constitute a socially upsetting factor; and, (2) the bused and receiving school children, although friendly in school, did not see much of each other on weekends or during vacations.

Another study of Berkeley was done by Marascuilo and Levin.[1] They found that the "same" situation was perceived differently by Negro and white students in a newly desegregated school. When students were asked whether students of both races mixed "often" in the school, 38 percent of the whites and 46 percent of the Negroes said yes. When asked whether mixing occurred "sometimes," the affirmative answers were 51 percent and 43 percent. The researchers note: "... The number of new friends made from the other race is a more important determinant of perceived social mixing than is the race of the perceiver .... Students who had made many friends from other races liked school better, liked their teachers better, and liked their classmates better."[2]

The Teele-Jackson-Mayo study of busing in Boston reported that "with regard to white friends, the [Negro] mothers report that 76 percent, 18 percent, and 6 percent of their children, respectively, have more, the same, and fewer white friends this year."[3]

Gordon studied the educational consequences of joining together students of extraordinarily varying social circumstances.[4] In September, 1961, the virtually all-Negro Carver, Michigan, school district was merged, by state direction, into the adjacent Oak Park district, an upper-middle class white suburb of Detroit. The percentage distribution of father's occupation of the merged student body was as follows:[1]

	Negro	White
Professional or Proprietor	3	46
Skilled	26	48
Unskilled	66	3
No Response	5	2

(On the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Oak Park fourth graders were at the 94th percentile, Carver students, at the 9th.)

Gordon found that Negro students participated less than whites in extra-curricular activities and held office less frequently. Athletic activities were the great exception; Negroes, in fact, joined non-academic school clubs at a ratio of about eight to one, while whites at about one to one.[2] As for Negro-white social contacts, many more incidents arose between Negro and white girls than between boys. Apparently, one of the basic reasons for these tensions was economic and psychological; white girls were able to afford more expensive and contemporary clothing and this aroused resentment. Lipton found the same thing in his integrated school in Hartsdale, New York.[3]

Contrary to his expectation Gordon found that Negro students did not tend significantly to defer to whites in selecting companions and leaders; a good deal of self-selection occurred Yet, there was a certain amount of white snobbery that also occurred:[4]

> ... 16 percent of the Negro students indicated that the fellow student they would most like to know falls into the white student categroy, while among white students only 1 percent indicated a desire to know most a fellow student who is in the Negro student category.

Gordon had predicted significantly more interaction between Negro and Jewish students. This was true only in part; interracial social relations were marginal with all religious groups. Also, there was much more interracial social contact between boys than girls.

Gordon found, as predicted, that white students would adapt to "those student activities in which Negroes engage and which tend to enhance the self-perception and status of white students."[1] More white students now go out for varsity athletics since Negro students have come to Oak Park. The formation of a Human Relations Club in 1964-1965 is another example of adaptive behavior by white students. Another, unintended, adaptation is in a cooperative training program instituted in 1963-1964 as a work-study device especially for Negro seniors. When Gordon made his study, he found that whites in the program outnumbered Negroes.

The academic achievement levels of white students remain high; a great number still plan to attend college. Negro achievement remains low. Still, some signs indicate a change. In 1962, no Negro graduates entered college; in 1964, six percent did. At Northern High School, a Negro ghetto school in Detroit -- which a number of Carver children had attended before coming to Oak Park -- only twenty-seven percent of the students planned to enter college at some time; nearly half the Negro students at Oak Park planned similarly.[2]

The expressed self-confidence scores of Negro students dropped. In 1961, 96 fourth through eighth graders at Carver elementary were asked whether they were confident in being able to succeed at Oak Park. Ninety-five percent replied yes. In 1965, Negro students at Oak Park High were asked the same question and seventy-two percent replied yes. Two observations should be made. First, as Gordon stresses, nearly three-quarters of the Negro children actually at Oak Park are still confident of succeeding; this is perhaps a more significant figure than the earlier 95 percent. Second, considering the objective achievement and social status gulf between the two groups of children, a modest drop from 95 to 72 percent might reflect a necessary and realistic adjustment by the Negro children. Gordon concludes that "lower-class Negro students from Carver performed more adequately than is generally true of lower-class Negro students. The high achieving student culture of Oak Park was clearly a factor in this change."[1]

Throughout his study, Gordon applied the anthropological concept of acculturation as an explanatory framework. A major advantage of this approach is that the desegregation situation is viewed from the interaction of white and Negro rather than simply the effect of an autonomous "situation" on Negro children. Statistical demonstration is not as important in such a study.

N. Bradley studied the desegregation of seven colleges in Tennessee.[2] Five hundred eighty-three Negro students constituted the very large sample. Nearly half were reported as making satisfactory progress even though the mean score for 275 Negro freshman students was below the 20th percentile for college-bound students on the ACT.[3] No real discipline problems were reported. No Negroes belonged to white fraternities or sororities; very few were allowed to live in college dormitories. "There is little, if any, open friction, but there is little real social integration," said a professor to Bradley.[4]

Students stated that racial exclusion or discrimination was the single most unsatisfactory feature of their campus life. On the other hand, when they were asked to list the most satisfactory aspect of their college experience, sixty percent referred to factors with racial overtones:[1]

29.6%	Meeting, mixing, understanding, accepting and learning about different races.
17.4%	Bring accepted as a person by helpful instructors and/or friendly students.
13.0%	Meeting the challenge of competition, or coping with whites.

While they stated their greatest difficulty to be keeping up academically, Bradley reports that "no special institutional services were provided especially for the Negro undergraduates."[2]

Racial attitudes of kindergarteners were the subject of Handler's study.[3] She set up an experimental interracial group of 33 children and a control group of 26 in a suburban area. Deliberate instruction was aimed at reducing prejudice. Thus, Handler's project went beyond desegregation. Her goal had been to help the children "define persons less in terms of racial features than they had previously done." Both white and Negro children achieved this goal in some measure; children in the control group, however, actually retrogressed. Nevertheless, "the white children still equated 'skin-color' with cleanliness after all intervening experiences . . . . [while] the Negro children as a total group related cleanliness to bathing and not skin."[4]

It is often predicted that peer relations will be impaired when children of different races are also of differing intelligence levels. Kaplan and Matkom studied this matter in a desegregated northern school.[5] Subjects were 284 white and 88 Negro children drawn from grades two through eight. While the white children were predominantly lower middle class, the Negro children lived in very poor circumstances and in a segregated area.

Kaplan and Matkom administered sociometric tests to the children. They found that "when Negro and white children of similar sociometric status are compared, the white children tend to have higher intelligence on reading test scores."[1] The researchers suggest that the Negro children's sociometric success, so to speak, demonstrates that "the I Q or reading score is not an adequate reflection of the ability of Negro children and that these children may be perceived by others as brighter, and as having more of the valued intellectual and social skills than test scores or classroom achievement shows."[2] A check was made to ensure that the high sociometric choices were not simply the result of Negroes voting for Negroes; this was found not to be the case. All in all, conclude Kaplan and Matkom hopefully: "The classroom atmosphere is not a simple reflection of the white-Negro feeling in the respective communities."[3]

Chesler and Segal made a comprehensive study of desegregation in Alabama.[4] Their interviewers -- all Negro college students -- talked, during June - August, 1966, with a total of 217 Negro students who had attended a white junior high or high school in Alabama during the 1965 - 1966 school year. This number was equal to "over 40% of the entire population of Negro junior and senior high students attending desegregated public schools in Alabama in 1965 - 1966."[5] A control group of 75 Negro students was established; these were persons who lived near a desegregator but who, for one reason or another, had not transferred to the white school. Thirty-nine white teachers who had taught in the desegregated schools were also interviewed.

The desegregators were extremely apprehensive about what reception they would meet in the white school:[1]

> . . . Over one-fourth of the Negro students went to school expecting to be beaten or harmed physically . . . . Another 52% felt "uneasy" or "worried," but not actually scared.

(These fears were realistic. In Alba, Alabama, where two Negro children had desegregated the town's high school, two separate bomb explosions occurred in January, 1966.[2]) Chesler and Segal summarize the students' actual experience: "Quite clearly, Negro students experienced considerable indifference and rejection, and often physical and emotional brutality, when they entered white schools."[3] Yet, fifteen percent of the desegregators reported "positive reactions" and seventy-four percent said some whites had acted in a friendly way.[4] Nearly half (48%) said they belonged to an interracial school club.

Chesler and Segal compared the desegregators with the control group of non-desegregators. There was no significant difference between the educational level of parents of either group. While both groups of students had the same educational aspirations, the desegregators had significantly higher expectations (80% vs. 65%) of attending college. Most significant for the study, the researchers reported that "desegregators seem to be less negatively prejudiced against whites, and more actively concerned about change and their efforts in change roles."[5] This finding is clearly in line with those of

Singer, Haggstrom, and Blake.

Had the desegregators' perceptions of white students changed? As the researchers report: "It is clear that before entering the white school Negro youngsters had an unrealistically low estimate of their abilities in relation to white students."[1] But experience is, at times, a great teacher. When desegregators were asked whether, before transferring, they thought white students could be smarter, 63 percent said yes. After desegregation, however, only 22 still thought so.[2] Table 4 shows the change in perceptions in terms of before and after:[3]

Table 4

Desegregators' Changing Perceptions of their Intellectual Abilities Compared to White Peers
(by percent)

Are they smarter?	Did you think they'd be smarter?	
	Yes	No
Yes	43	57
No	68	32

Note, too, that 68 percent of those who had expected the whites to be smarter had changed their minds; while 57 percent of those who had not expected the whites to be smarter changed their minds. (Incidentally, over three-quarters of the desegregators reported that the white students turned out to be noisier and less well-behaved than they had expected.)

Contacts with whites outside class were reported by a majority of desegregators; three-quarters of the group regarded at least some of the white students as friends. Did they trust whites more or less since desegregation? Thirty-seven percent said more but forty-one percent said less.

How had the desegregators fared in academic achievement? No test scores or school records were available, and so self-reports of grades were recorded. Table 5 summarizes the results for desegregators and non-desegregators:[1]

Table 5

Self Report of Change in Grades During Two School Years in Desegregator and Control Population

Change	Desegregators (N = 197)	Control
Grades increased	11.3%	26.6%
Grades remained unchanged	28.2	49.3
Grades declined	60.5	24.0

What appears to have been a disastrous change for the worse is probably the very opposite. As Chesler and Segal report: "Overall, 83 percent of the desegregators unequivocally said they gained a lot from being in the white school, and the rest felt they made gains although they had been severely or moderately tempered by sacrifices."[2]

The Chesler-Segal study is rare for its locale, exemplary for its modest aims, and excellent for the rigorous care with which it was carried out. Its findings are rich in implications for desegregation, North and South.

2. Student and Teacher

Gottlieb studied inner city Negro and white teachers' views of their students.[1] All teachers were given a checklist with a number of character traits of students and were asked to check those that applied to the students (all of whom were Negro). White teachers tended to see the Negro child as highstrung, impetuous, lazy, moody, rebellious, and talkative. Negro teachers, on the other hand, viewed students as ambitious, cooperative, energetic, fun-loving, and happy. These characterizations are based on the items below (Table 6) on which there is a fifteen percent or higher difference between Negro and white teachers.[2]

Table 6

Teachers' Race and Student Perceptions

Traits	White (%)	Negro (%)
Ambitious	20	36
Cooperative	35	61
Energetic	33	48
Fun loving	45	74
Happy	31	65
Highstrung	39	3
Impetuous	33	13
Lazy	53	19
Middle-brow	4	19
Moody	33	13
Rebellious	35	13
Talkative	59	6

Clearly, both groups of teachers differ greatly in orientation toward their students. A similarly great disparity in orientation is evident in Table 7.[3]

Table 7

Teachers' Race and Reasons for Job Dissatisfaction

Reasons	White % of Total Responses	Negro % of Total Responses
Inadequate materials and poor facilities	6	33
Crowded classrooms	13	38
Lack of parental interest	25	6
Behavior-discipline problems	46	19
Others	10	4
	100	100

All in all, the Negro teacher sees the major obstacles in the physical supplies and facilities, whereas the white teachers stress shortcomings in the students and their parents. White teachers tended to be pessimistic about the educational future of the children. But, holds Gottlieb, "the Negro teachers are less pessimistic in the evaluations of students since many of the teachers themselves have come from backgrounds similar to that of their students yet managed to overcome social barriers and attain positions of responsibility and status."[1] A question could be raised as to the applicability of these findings to the desegregated school. White teachers who carried their attitudes into the desegregated school would create a special handicap for Negro children. On the other hand, it would be important for Negro teachers to be on hand.

In the previous chapter we noted Gottlieb's research bearing on the need to create truly integrated schools rather than interracial schools in which Negro and white students simply co-existed.

Wey and Corey reported on desegregation problems and progress in seventy desegregated school districts.[1] Some white teachers were found to have certain difficulties in desegregation. For example, Wey and Corey pointed out that "white teachers who usually knew names of new white pupils within a week found it difficult to identify Negro pupils and call them by name unless the Negroes were placed by seating charts."[2]

In Chapter II, we examined Bindman's findings on Negro student achievement at the University of Illinois. He found that poorly prepared Negro students were reluctant to face their need for special help and so tended not to seek it out. This tendency was furthered by the students' general feeling of social isolation on the campus. While some staff members "perform their duties in an openly discriminatory manner,"[3] the Negro student, Bindman continues, "is often surprised at the 'good treatment' he receives from faculty and administrators and ... in only a few cases perceives faculty members as hostile to him."[4]

In Lockwood's study, reported in Chapter II, it was found that Negro students in the two racially-balanced schools considered classroom participation significantly more important than did Negro children in five imbalanced schools. Yet, they personally did not participate in classroom activities any more than children in the latter schools.[5]

Gilliland studied certain aspects of Negro learning in Oak Ridge, Tennessee High School.[6] Negro students constitute six percent of enrollment (111 out of 1,800) at what Gilliland describes as "a large competitive and academically oriented high school." He was concerned with the problem we have seen in Chapter II -- the tendency of Negro students in a desegregated school to soft-pedal academic interests and overstress athletics and other non-academic pursuits. The researcher attempted to change these attitudes by use of small group counselling. Thirty Negro students were assigned to four small groups; sessions continued over a year. A control group was set up.

At the end of the year, "experimental groups excelled the control groups on all measures of scholastic endeavor plus all personal scales and inventories except the Index of Adjustment and Values Test."[1] Both the students' educational promise and personal potential had benefited. "Although the expressive actions of Negro adolescents portrayed predominantly non-cognitive, blustery, physical patterns of behavior," concluded Gilliland, "there emerged a manifest desire for successful scholastic achievement which had been carefully masked by overt activities."[2]

In the Chesler-Segal study of Alabama, discussed earlier in this chapter, the role of teachers was examined in two respects: (1) its relation to classroom atmosphere, and (2) its expectancy or non-expectancy of achievement by the Negro desegregators. While three quarters of the desegregators regarded their white teachers as fair minded, most teachers permitted white students to establish the tone of the classroom. This laissez-faire attitude of the teachers increased tensions. Where teachers were seen as fair minded, the white students in the classroom were generally also so regarded. Thus, the classroom atmosphere pretty well reflected the leadership (or lack of it) shown by teachers.

Some teachers were cruel to the Negro students: "About one third of the descriptions of unfair behavior identified teachers who called students 'nigger', or had ... mispronounced 'Negro'. More than another one third of such unfair reports noted that students felt they were singled out by their teachers or mistreated .... ."[1]

Teachers at first underestimated the academic ability of the Negro students: "Only 75% of the teachers reported that before the desegregators entered their classes they did not think the Negro students would be as smart as the white students. By the end of the year or two of desegregation, however, half of that 75% had changed their minds .... ."[2] Desegregation was an important experience of discovery by many people. Many desegregators found they could do as well as white students; many teachers gained a more respectful conception of Negro abilities. (One wonders how the white students felt about all this; but, unfortunately, the Chesler-Segal team was unable to interview them.)

Boney reports on Negro social style on white campuses.[3] Reporting from a northern university, Boney observes: "... Nonwhite students tend to assign a disproportionate amount of importance to the evaluations of whites with reference to their role expectations. Docile and submissive behaviors in racially integrated learning situations are expected and rewarded by many white teachers."[4]

In virtually none of the above studies of desegregation is there any indication that special teaching or curricular adaptations were made. When Baltimore's schools underwent their initial desegregation in 1955, for example, the school administration held that "special 'preparation' of teachers for integrated schools was unnecessary, and would probably do more harm than good by calling attention to differences when teachers should think of likenesses."[1] Such a view was wholly consistent with common sense and, since virtually no large-scale desegregation projects had occurred anywhere to show otherwise, very possibly correct. Since then, however, a good deal of experience has been accumulated. Repeated studies have shown the importance of deliberate classroom changes that are required for effective desegregation. In Chapter II, Gottlieb was cited in this regard. Later in the present chapter, we shall cite Katz; and in Chapter VI, Pettigrew.

If, as was demonstrated in Chapter II, greater learning occurs in desegregated than segregated schools and classrooms, then why are any further preparations needed? In the same Baltimore report just quoted, the following statement appears: "There can be no doubt that many [teachers] in their hearts prefer segregation and regret the new policy of interracial schools."[2] This is a prime reason for taking special measures as part of a desegregation program. As Chesler puts it, we cannot depend on "doing what comes naturally": "Too much of what is natural in American race relations is distrustful and separatist; desegregation itself is a departure from our natural social patterns, and other breaks with tradition are vital."[3]

Yet, Blake cautions against assuming that desegregation increases the number of disadvantaged children and thus occasions the training of teachers to deal with this additional disadvantage.[1] He states:[2]

> When schools are desegregated, there is not an increase in the number of disadvantaged children. They may [now] be distributed in different schools but that does not automatically mean that teachers in these schools are ill-equipped to teach them.

Blake urges that different kinds of measures need to be taken to improve "education in biracial settings."[3] If teachers in a desegregated school are not competent to teach, both Blake and Chesler say, they should be trained further: "Only teachers in a desegregated school who are incompetent to teach the disadvantaged need the additional training"[4] (Blake); "The teacher who is a skilled and fully competent professional has a good start on being successful in an interracial situation."[5]

A small-scale example of teacher preparation for desegregation rather than disadvantage is described by Zinberg.[6] Teachers from Arlington, Massachusetts, a white middle-class suburb of Boston, met with teachers from an all-Negro Roxbury school in groups of sixteen, for two sessions of one and three quarter hours' length. A psychiatrist led the group discussions. The aim was to learn what to expect when the Arlington schools would receive some Negro children from Boston. Although the time was minimal, apparently the Arlington teachers came nearer to comprehending the human hurt of segregation and discrimination. Zinberg concluded:[7]

> . . . The problem to be faced by the teacher who chooses to participate in this social change is clearly a larger one than simple presiding over integrated classes in such a way that no unpleasant incidents occur. He must work with deeper hurt feelings from past difficulties and with the prejudices that exist by the time children reach his classroom.

Zinberg makes clear the need of the teacher to face up to his own prejudices.

In discussions of school desegregation, sooner of later the issue of academic standards arises. We have seen that desegregation and rising academic achievement are quite compatible. We have also seen, however, that teachers will sometimes entertain low academic standards for Negro children. An academic standard is essentially a matter of teacher's expectations. In the Chesler-Segal study we saw how teachers had pitched their expectations of performance of Negro students much too low. The connection between teacher expectations and student performance has been illuminated dramatically by Rosenthal.[1]

During Spring, 1964, some children in the first two grades of a west coast elementary school were designated part of an experimental group, others part of a control group. Both types of children remained in the same room. Teachers were given names of one fifth of the children who, according to the experimenters, were especially capable and were "earmarked for intellectual growth"; these made up the experimental group. The remaining children were designated as ordinary and constituted the control group.

In fact, however, the experimental children were no brighter. The only difference between the two groups, as Rosenthal states, "was in the mind of the teacher."[2] I Q tests were administered at the beginning and at the end of the experimental period. While nearly one fifth of the control children gained twenty or more I Q points, two-and-one-half times that number (47%) in the experimental group made the same gain.[1] "... The children from whom intellectual growth was expected," reported Rosenthal, "became more intellectually alive and autonomous or at least were so perceived by their teachers."[2] Curiously, when selected control children developed "unexpectedly," they seemed to show undesirable behavior as well, or at least were so perceived by the teacher. Teachers continued to play favorites even within the experimental group. Children in the lowest track, even though they scored relatively as high as other experimental children in relation to the control group, were nevertheless ranked less favorably than upper-track children by teachers.

Another issue considered by Rosenthal is of special relevance to desegregation. He rejected the "Robbing Peter to Pay Paul" hypothesis. This formulation describes a classroom situation in which the learning gains of some students were won at the expense of other students. But in Rosenthal's experiment this did not happen. Instead, "the greater the gain made by the children of whom gain was expected, the greater the gain made in the same classroom by those children from whom no special gain was expected."[3] It would be fascinating to study from this viewpoint the precise effect on achievement in those Alabama classrooms of changing teacher expectations. (See comments on the Chesler-Segal study, above.)

Rosenthal concludes hopefully:[4]

> It may be that as teacher training institutions acquaint teachers to be with the possibility that their expectations of their pupils' performance may serve as self-fulfilling prophecies, these teacher trainees may be given a new expectancy -- that children can learn more than they believed possible.

This conclusion is highly consistent with an empirical conclusion by Gordon and Wilkerson on the education of disadvantaged children.[5]

3. The Family

In the preceding pages we have had occasion to refer to the role of the student's family in desegregation. Meketon stressed the supportive and counseling functions of parents. Coles has cited numerous clinical examples of the same phenomenon. Anderson found that the achievement of desegregated Negro children bore no relationship to whether or not the children's families were intact or broken. In 1956, the schools of Louisville were redistricted and many children were assigned to schools of the opposite race. Garth reports that 45 percent of the Negro parents and 85 percent of the white parents involved requested that their children be transferred to schools of their own race.[1]

In three studies, white children in desegregated schools were found to be less prejudiced than the white community in general: (1) in Alabama, according to Chesler and Segal, (2) in an integrated northern school, according to Kaplan and Matkom, and (3) in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, according to Sartain.[2] In their study of interracial schools in several small midwestern communities, Schmuck and Luszki found Negro students to be performing uniformly on a level at or above white students.[3] As measured by students' responses, Negro parents were more interested in children's schoolwork than were white parents; also, "Negro boys spoke of their families in significantly more positive terms than the white boys."[4]

Meyers studied Negro achievement in relation to family structures.[1] Her sample consisted of 46 Negro boys from a Harlem school; all were of normal intelligence and were evenly divided between good and poor achievers. She found:[2]

> The hypothesis that Negro boys from an economically disadvantaged environment with a positive self-concept would be achievers in the elementary school situation was supported . . . . Based on a qualitative analysis of family interaction, a body of evidence was presented to support the final hypothesis that Negro boys would function as school achievers if at least one parent, or some adult in loco parentis, assumed executive guidance and control over the household.

Meyers pointed to the motivating influence of the civil rights movement and related activities and observed that these factors raised "new perspectives for teachers, guidance counselors, psychologists and family life educators working with and within the Negro community."[3] Rosenberg's study of parental interest, although not dealing specifically with Negro children and parents, arrived at a conclusion that is not dissonant with Meyers' conclusion: "... Rather extreme [parental] indifference is associated with low self-esteem, but whether the interest in the child is strong or mild often appears to make less difference."[4] More broadly, a national study of school principals reported "that principals perceive that even in schools in the most disadvantaged areas, a large majority of the parents are interested in their children's performance."[5]

4. The Katz Research

In 1964, psychologist Irwin Katz reviewed evidence from research on desegregation.[1] The review was highly tentative because of the paucity of studies. As a result, Katz's article contains several assertions about this fact:

1. "... Much of the evidence to be surveyed is only inferential." [2]
2. "There is a dearth of unequivocal information about Negro performance in desegregated schools"[3]
3. "However, there does not exist at present any comprehensive system of variables for predicting the specific effects of different conditions of stress on the Negro child's performance of various academic tasks." [4]
4. "Reports on the academic progress of Negro children in desegregated schools are on the whole inadequate for drawing any conclusions about the effects of bi-racial environments upon Negro performance." [5]

In his article, Katz summarized a series of experiments he and colleagues had conducted. They involved the effect of race of interviewer and/or competitor on the learning of Negro college students. Katz found that Negro students' awareness of competition by whites served to induce stress which, in turn, could be assumed to interfere with learning: "Research on psychological stress generally supports the assumption that social threat and failure threat are detrimental to complex learning."[6]

Some read this conclusion to indicate the likelihood that desegregation, by arousing anxieties in the desegregated Negro student, might not be in the student's real interest. Katz himself drew no such implication. Instead, as we have seen, he regretted the lack of evidence.

Since 1964, Katz has written three additional reviews of research.[7] Other reviews have also been published.[8] A body of research has been built up. It is thus anachronistic still to cite the 1964 Katz article as an adequate review of research.[9]

Katz has made one of the foremost attempts thus far to work out a social psychological theory of academic achievement and motivation in relation to racial differences. Following is a sketch of the theory.[1] Wherever feasible, we will refer to studies reviewed in the present work to illustrate or raise a question about the theory.

We can begin with the fact, experimentally observed, that Negro male college students tend to achieve less in the presence of white persons. A Negro in white situations is surrounded by symbols of social success; but while the incentive of success is high, the expectancy is low. He knows how much he's missing, but he's afraid he'll keep on missing it, he'll never catch up. The problem is how to raise the Negro's expectancy of success; with this, social achievement should rise, too.

In a series of experiments with college students, Katz found that "Negro students who had been average achievers in high school ... were discouraged at the prospect of being evaluated by a white person, except when they were made to believe their chances of success were very good. But Negro students with a history of high academic achievement ... seemed to be stimulated by the challenge of white evaluation, regardless of the objective probability of success."[2] The "evaluator" is analogous to the white teacher, not the white student. What Katz is saying, therefore, is that inasmuch as many Negro children have had a poor academic record, the whiteness of the teacher may well prove an added burden in the desegregated situation. The crucial feature of the situation, however, is not the color but the encouragement that the Negro child may receive from the white teacher.

A further point made by Katz is that Negro children, along with most lower-class children, have not experienced much outright parental approval while performing intellectual tasks. Thus, they "remain more dependent than middle-class children on social reinforcement when performing academic tasks."[1] From Katz's further research, some still unpublished, he explained this point in more detail:[2]

> [Negro] children are likely to be highly dependent on the immediate environment for the setting of standards and dispensing of rewards . . . . Teacher attitudes toward Negro children will be highly important for their classroom behavior.[2]

Support for this interpretation comes from a study by Wayson who found that "the children need me" was a reason very frequently offered by experienced teachers who remained in slum schools.[3]

Still another point made by Katz is that not white skin color but higher educational standards are a major part of the explanation for increased Negro achievement in white classrooms. The Negro students in Alabama (Chesler-Segal study) claimed to be making considerable personal gains although their school grades suffered as a result of transferring to a white school. A sizable part of their satisfaction is explicitly derived from their conviction that the white teachers are better than the Negro teachers in the segregated schools. It is not known whether the Negro students were aware that many of the same white teachers underestimated the academic capability of Negro students.

Katz locates the major source of cultural differences in learning in self-control, that is, the ability to sustain "effort on tasks that are not consistently interesting, attractive, and which offer no immediate extrinsic payoff, either positive or negative."[1] Such sustained control results from a process of socialization, that is, standards of excellence are internalized and one's self develops the ability to "guide and energize performance whenever either immediate or delayed social evaluation is anticipated."[2] Middle-class children have a greater opportunity to develop such a willingness to learn -- or, better, to study.

A dominant concept in motivation theory is the need to achieve (n Achievement) which is regarded by many psychologists as a universal human disposition to strive for achievement. Can it be said that low academic achievement results, in part or whole, from a deficient n Achievement? Katz doubts the usefulness of the concept in this area: "... The lower class Negro pupil's disinterest in classroom learning may be less a matter of his lacking the achievement motive than of its being directed into nonintellectual pursuits."[3] In other words, the pupil might prefer to save his striving for the achievement of more worldly goals which are available outside the school building.

Katz returns, then, to explore further the development of self-regulatory behaviors. He is especially interested in learning more about the development of means of dispensing self-approval and self-disapproval so as to produce higher levels of performance. He reports preliminary findings from ongoing studies he and his colleagues are conducting at the Sampson School, a predominantly Negro school in Detroit. In this experiment in "the socialization of competence," Katz discovered that "low-achieving boys were more self-critical than high-achieving boys, and later showed a weak tendency to avoid a stimulus that had been associated with self-critical responses."[4]

To be dissatisfied with one's own performance, to be self-critical, one must be able to measure one's own behavior against a standard. These low-achieving boys must have entertained high standards to be so disappointed in their own performance. Katz finds intriguing "the implication that among northern Negro children from homes of average quality, academic failure is not necessarily associated with low or unstable achievement standards."[1] The Negro children, that is to say, seem not to be failing because they are uninterested in learning. One cannot say, in other words, that these children "lack motivation."

In one sense, they are too well-motivated. So rigid is their self-judgment that "what they seem to have internalized was a most effective mechanism for self-discouragement. The child ... had been socialized to self-image failure."[2] Katz stresses that these children are not only punishing themselves by overly-harsh self-judgments; they are also suffering from "a history of punitive reactions by socializing agents,"[3] among them -- presumably -- the schools and parents. He assumes that the overly self-critical child has been overexposed to negative enforcements from parents and teachers. Katz states: "Low achievement, anxiety, and a propensity for self-devaluation, which are all interrelated, are each in turn related to perception of low parental interest and acceptance, and high parental punitiveness."[4] (In the research of Garth, reported in Chapter III, it will be recalled that transferees to white schools generally were severe in self-criticism.)

High parental aspirations for their children have no real consequences for the parents because they do not know how to implement the aspirations. Their children however, regard the parental aspiration as a directive and now try to fulfill the expectation. Typically, it does not work out. Katz speculates:[1]

> I suspect that as part of his adjustment to failure, the low-achieving Negro student learns to use expressions of interest and ambition as a verbal substitute for behavior he is unable to enact. ... As the Negro student falls increasingly behind in his school work, the expression of high verbal standards contributes to a growing demoralization.

Part of this interpretation resembles Blake's viewpoint.

The gap between expectation and reality is widened by the tendency of Negro school children to be taught by those whom Katz calls "teachers who are really unqualified for their role, who basically resent teaching them, and who therefore behave in ways that foster in the more dependent students tendencies toward debilitating self-criticism."[2]

If the child's very socialization is at fault, what may be done to remedy the educational deficiency? Katz holds that desegregation has demonstrated the feasibility of highly significant learning advances for large numbers of Negro students. More is to be gained than a simple increment in factual learning: [3]

> ... The opportunity for biracial comparison is highly stimulating because it provides more useful information for self-evaluation than does comparison with other Negroes. This is so because, in general, white standards of intellectual ability and achievement are more relevant to future career prospects. Thus, biracial peer comparisons are socially facilitating because of their informational value.

Especially if ego-threats to the Negro child are minimized, he can benefit greatly from desegregated situations in which he measures himself and is evaluated cross-racially. As Katz comments: "Here emotional supportiveness on the part of the teachers would be of critical importance, both in its direct significance to Negro children, and in its influence upon the social reactions of their classmates."[1] His own experiments support this observation.

Yet, Katz is still puzzled by the persistence of some children. "Why is it," he asks, "that the low ability [Negro] children give no indication of being demoralized by the large achievement gap between themselves and their white classmates?" With a candor rare in the literature, he replies: "I do not know the answer. . . ."[2] He suggests, however, that participation in an interracial classroom gives the "overly self-critical, segregated children who had accepted a grossly exaggerated conception of their inferiority" a chance to correct the faulty self-evaluation. Singer's study affirms the crucial contribution of cross-racial comparison to self-concept of Negro children. This thread weaves its way through numerous other research studies. Finally, Katz warns against ability grouping as it is presently practiced as unhelpful and perhaps detrimental.[3] One thinks of Gunthorpe's study in this regard.

In brief, then, Katz theorizes that the Negro deficit in school achievement results from inadequate socialization of self-directed learning. This weakness is compounded by repeated negativistic experiences in school and family. An exaggerated sense of discouragement develops. It can be overcome only by a considerate, sympathetic classroom regime that permits the Negro child to measure himself against white children and thereby gain a more accurate self-concept. In a middle-class classroom the lower-class Negro child can benefit from improved learning opportunities and relate his learning more directly to a career. This should afford him ample opportunity to develop the ability to direct his own learning.[4]

5. Summary

Student relations under desegregation have been marked by toleration, for the most part, and, less prominently, both violence and positive respect. In many more cases than one would imagine, interracial friendships have developed. The old "saw"about students being more "liberal" than their parents is quite true, according to various studies. Whether in Syracuse or Detroit, students of the most varied social circumstances have learned to cooperate, and to their mutual benefit. Very few studies afford insights into the behavior of white students under desegregation.

Most administrative planning for desegregation has concerned political and (white) community problems; very little has dwelt on changes in classroom and curriculum. By and large, however, teachers seem to have attended to the single most important change in the classroom -- they have made the Negro children feel welcome. This is far from saying that interracial classrooms are typically operating at or even near the maximum benefit to both Negro and white children.

The relation of the Negro family to successful desegregation is very intimate and necessary. On the other hand, we have many more case studies than systematic researches on the issue. It is difficult to piece the case studies together into a meaningful whole.

FOOTNOTES

Page 113

1. Joan H. Criswell, A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom (N.Y.: Archives of Psychology, January, 1939).

2. Ibid., p. 79.

Page 114

1. W. H. Boone, "Problems of Adjustment of Negro Students at a White School," Journal of Negro Education, October, 1942, p. 483. See, also, in the same issue the engaging article by Edythe Hargrave, "How I Feel as a Negro at a White College."

2. Robin M. Williams, Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan (eds.), Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954, p. 244 .

3. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960).

Page 115

1. Donald N. Lombardi, "Factors Affecting Change in Attitude Toward Negroes Among High School Students," Journal of Negro Education, Spring, 1963.

2. Theodore F. Dunn, Assumed Racial Similarity as Related to Attitudes Toward Integration, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, American University, 1958, abstract in Dissertation Abstracts, XIX, 1959, p. 2533.

3. Claye, A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro, pp. 87-88.

4. Robert J. Dwyer, "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, March, 1958.

5. Hilda Taba, School Culture Studies of Participation and Leadership (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955), p. 95.

6. Staten W. Webster, Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effects Upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh-Grade Pupils, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1960; see, also, Webster, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," Journal of Educational Psychology, LII (1961).

Page 117

1. Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," pp. 20-21.

2. Cleveland A. Thomas, "The Independent School and Desegregation," School Review, 69 (1961), p. 272.

3. Ibid., p. 275.

4. Frank F. Lee, Negro and White in Connecticut Town (N.Y.: Bookman, 1961).

5. Ibid., p. 76.

Page 118

1. Ibid., p. 61.

2. I. N. Berlin, "Desegregation Creates Problems, Too," Saturday Review, June 15, 1963.

3. Lawrence E. Vredevoe, "The Effort to Desegregate and Its Effects Upon School Discipline and Attitudes," Journal of Secondary Education, February, 1967; an earlier article by the same author restates the same argument: "The Effects of Desegregation on School Discipline," Education Digest, April, 1965.

4. Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals (N.Y.: Wiley, 1966), p. 51.

5. Clark and Plotkin, The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges, p. 29.

6. Nancy H. St. John, "De Facto Segregation and Interracial Association in High School," Sociology of Education, Summer, 1964.

Page 119

1. Calvin Trillin, An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes (N.Y.: Viking, 1964), p. 58. See, also, Hansjorg Elshorst, "Two Years After Integration: Race Relations at a Deep South University," Phylon, Spring, 1967; the school is Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge.

Page 120

1. Dean R. Lusienski, An Analysis of the Scores of Urban Negro Boys on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, University of Nebraska, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-11,936.

2. Ibid., p. 68.

3. Ibid., p. 89.

4. Gladyce H. Bradley, "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1964, p. 92.

Page 121

1. Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University, p. 127.

2. Ibid., pp. 189-190.

3. Jonsson, Maternal, Teacher and Pupil Attitudes Toward Busing, Integration, and Related Issues in Berkeley Elementary Schools (Berkeley: Berkeley Unified School District, October, 1966), p. 19.

4. Ibid., p. 48.

Page 122

1. Leonard A. Marascuilo and Joel R. Levin, "Inter- and Intra-Racial Group Differences in the Perception of a Social Situation," unpublished paper read at the February, 1966, annual meeting of the American Education Research Association.

2. Ibid., pp. 6 and 9.

3. Teele, Jackson and Mayo, "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," p. 305.

4. Leonard Gordon, An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Wayne State University, 1966. University Microfilm No. 67-660. See, also, Gordon, "The Carver-Oak Park Merger," Integrated Education, June - July, 1965.

Page 123

1. Ibid., p. 98.

2. Ibid., p. 119.

3. Aaron Lipton, "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," Integrated Education, June - July, 1965, p. 15.

4. Gordon, p. 129.

Page 124

1. Ibid., p. 165.

2. Ibid., p. 194.

Page 125

1. Ibid., p. 233.

2. Nolen E. Bradley, Jr., The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966. University Microfilms No. 66-12,606.

3. Ibid., p. 74.

4. Ibid., p. 104.

Page 126

1. Ibid., p. 84.

2. Ibid., p. 127.

3. June M. Handler, An Attempt to Change Kindergarten Children's Attitudes of Prejudice Toward the Negro, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1966. University Microfilms No. 67-2804.

4. Ibid., p. 146.

5. Henry K. Kaplan and Anthony J. Matkom, "Peer Status and Intellectual Functioning of Negro School Children," Psychology in the Schools, April, 1967.

Page 127

1. Ibid., p. 183.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 184.

4. Mark A. Chesler and Phyllis Segal, Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September, 1967).

5. Ibid., p. 15.

Page 128

1. Ibid., p. 28.

2. See Integrated Education, April - May, 1966, p. 6.

3. Chesler and Segal, p. 36.

4. Ibid., pp. 31 and 35.

5. Ibid., p. 60.

Page 129

1. Ibid., p. 80.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 81.

Page 130

1. Ibid., p. 86.

2. Ibid., p. 85.

Page 131

1. David Gottlieb, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," August, 1963. Later published in Sociology of Education, Summer, 1964.

2. Ibid., p. 15.

3. Ibid., p. 13.

Page 132

1. Ibid., p. 17.

Page 133

1. Herbert W. Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation. A Guidebook (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959).

2. Ibid., p. 226.

3. Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University, p. 193.

4. Ibid., p. 180.

5. Lockwood, An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home Background, p. 53.

6. Burt E. Gilliland, An Evaluation of the Effects of Small Group Counseling with Negro Adolescents, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966. University Microfilms No. 67-1364.

Page 134

1. Ibid., p. 73.

2. Ibid., p. 79.

Page 135

1. Chesler and Segal, Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South, p. 42.

2. Ibid., p. 78.

3. J. Don Boney, "Some Dynamics of Disadvantaged Students in Learning Situations," Journal of Negro Education, Summer, 1967.

4. Ibid., pp. 318-319.

Page 136

1. Elinor Pancoast, The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools (Baltimore: Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, 1956), p. 103.

2. Ibid., p. 102.

3. Mark A. Chesler, Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

Page 137

1. Elias Blake, Jr., A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

5. Chesler, "Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms," p. 3.

6. Norman E. Zinberg, " A Group Approach With the School Teacher in the Integration Crisis," Mental Hygiene (April, 1967).

7. Ibid., pp. 297-298.

Page 138

1. Robert Rosenthal, "Changing Children's I Q by Changing Teachers' Expectations," unpublished paper read before the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 2, 1966.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Page 139

1. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

5. See Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Critique of Compensatory Education," in *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged* (N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966).

Page 140

1. Charles E. Garth, *Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools,* unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Kentucky, 1966, p. 31.

2. James A. Sartain, *Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, Vanderbilt University, 1966, p. 136. University Microfilms No. 66-10,999.

3. Richard Schmuck and Margaret B. Luszki, *A Comparison of Negro and White Students in Several Small Midwest Communities* (No place: No publisher, no date).

4. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Page 141

1. Edna O. Meyers, "Self-Concept, Family Structure, and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys," (abstract) (N.Y.: Northside Center for Child Development, n.d.).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

3. *Ibid.*

4. Morris Rosenberg, "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," Sociometry, March, 1963, p. 49. See, also, Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966).

5. Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals (N.Y.: Wiley, 1966), pp. 42-43.

Page 142

1. Irwin Katz, "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," American Psychologist, June, 1964.

2. Ibid., p. 381.

3. Ibid., p. 383.

4. Ibid., p. 390.

5. Ibid., p. 396.

6. Ibid., p. 396.

7. See Katz, "Status of Research on School Desegregation," IRCD Bulletin, September, 1965; Katz, "Research on Public School Desegregation," Integrated Education, August - September, 1966; and a revised version of the 1966 item was published late in 1967 by the IRCD, Yeshiva University.

8. Thomas F. Pettigrew and Patricia J. Pajonas, Social Psychological Considerations of Racially Imbalanced Schools published by the Massachusetts State Board of Education in April, 1965; Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965); and Nancy H. St. John and Nancy Smith, Annotated Bibliography of School Racial Mix and the Self Concept, Aspirations, Academic Achievement and Interracial Attitudes and Behavior of Negro Children (Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1967).

9. As does David A. Goslin, "The School in a Changing Society," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October, 1967.

Page 143

1. Based on Katz, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," 1966, to appear in the *International Journal of Psychology*; Katz, "The Socialization of of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (in press, 1967); and Katz, *Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research,* unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, November 16-18, 1967.

2. Katz, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," p. 4.

Page 144

1. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

3. William W. Wayson, *Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools,* unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1966.

Page 145

1. Katz, "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," p. 9.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Page 146

1. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

Page 147

1. Ibid., p. 48.

2. Ibid., p. 51. See results of Teacher Opinion Poll, "Teaching in Center-City Schools," NEA Journal, December, 1967, p. 63.

3. Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools, p. 16 (emphasis in original).

Page 148

1. Ibid., p. 18. See, also, comment by Nancy H. St. John, "The Effect of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," Harvard Educational Review, Summer, 1966, p. 294.

2. Ibid., p. 21.

3. That this was not understood in the earliest phases of desegregation can be seen from reports in Wey and Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation, pp. 220 and 231.

4. The general connection between self and future is explored through two different but helpful perspectives in: Herta Riese, Heal the Hurt Child. An Approach Through Educational Therapy With Special Reference to the Extremely Deprived Negro Child (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) and A. Irving Hallowell, Culture and Experience (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), chapter 4, "The Self and Its Behavioral Environment." Both views are summarized in Meyer Weinberg and Oscar Shabat, Society and Man, second edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 284-292 and 93-102.

CHAPTER V

NON-NEGRO MINORITIES

Indian-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans are the most educationally disadvantaged groups in the United States.[1] In numbers they include 500,000, 6,000,000, and 1,000,000 people.

As minorities, all three share certain disabilities in common. Being relatively powerless politically, their cultural distinctiveness has suffered from deliberate suppression as well as thoughtlessness. Segregation has been their usual lot in the schools, with Indian-Americans suffering the most from this separation.

In this Chapter, relatively few studies are reviewed primarily because of their relative sparseness. We are interested in studies that explore a number of aspects of the distinctive problems as well as some that show the commonality of educational problems of minority children. As much as possible we have sought to touch on the primary subjects raised in the preceding chapters.

I. Indian Americans

Scott studied the Tlingit Indians in Wrangell, Alaska.[1] He found them to be highly assimilated to the white population. Few Indian children speak or even understand Tlingit; parents urge their young to learn the ways of the whites and unlearn Indian ways. English is all but the universal language. The public school is attended by everyone except a small minority. "Children are not particularly concerned with racial distinctions," reports Scott, "and ... common education in the public school has tended to mitigate cultural differences."[2] Between 1913 and 1950, every fourth marriage in Wrangell was interracial.[3] So far has the process of assimilation gone that one Tlingit defined a "native" as "a person who is ashamed of his ancestors."[4] An economic transaction seems to underlay the entire social arrangement: the Indians have been permitted to continue their age-old fishing industry while the whites control everything else; and a good part of the manufacturing end of the fishing industry as well. The economic history of Tlingit-white relations includes no example of foreign destruction of Indian territory.

Anderson, Collister, and Ladd studied the Indian academic achievement in the continental United States.[5] They found that "the greater the degree of contact of the Indian child with the white man's culture, the higher he scores on educational tests."[6] Indian academic achievement was highest in public schools, and lower in the following order:

mission, nonreservation boarding, reservation boarding, and day schools.[1]

Five years later a much more pointed and detailed study was made by Coombs, Kron, Collister, and Anderson.[2] Altogether, the study covered 26,608 pupils (17,255 Indian, 9,353 white) in six geographical areas; the children were overwhelmingly rural. California Achievement Tests (CAT) were administered. Results were presented in group averages and so there was no opportunity to ascertain relative achievement by individual matching; no controls were used. Nor was there any effort to control socioeconomic status.

White fourth and fifth graders achieved near the norm on CAT; soon thereafter gains for both Indian and white children started falling. As time went on, the Indian-white achievement gap grew. In the tests, "Indian pupils compared best in spelling and least well in reading vocabulary."[3] Academic achievement was higher if English was spoken prior to school entrance, if the degree of "Indian blood" was lower, if the child lived off rather than on the reservation. Unfortunately, there is no way to tell whether the achievement was high because of living off the reservation, or whether one lived off the reservation if one had higher achievement. In the case of one area (Andarko), Indian children achieved about the same in the federal schools as white pupils in the Albuquerque public schools did. (Many of the latter were Mexican-Americans.)

Learning variation under different conditions of ethnic mixture is of some interest. The Coombs team found that:

> Fourth graders attending "mostly white" schools [in Aberdeen] were higher on the average on total score than those attending "mostly Indian" schools. ... In the Billings area ... seventh grade pupils attending schools which were "half Indian, half white" scored higher on the average than those in the "mostly Indian" schools.[1]

Reviewing all their data on the issue, the team concluded: "There is a slight indication that Indian pupils attending public schools enrolling a large proportion of white pupils achieve better than those attending public schools with mostly Indian pupils but the evidence is by no means conclusive."[2]

The researchers were interested in discovering patterns of relations between Indian and non-Indian. They found that the Indian children in public schools -- and thus in the best situation to choose friends from among non-Indians -- still chose by far the greatest number of their friends from among other Indian children. This was true in the Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Aberdeen areas. The non-Indian students of Albuquerque were unique in one respect: Many of them were Mexican-Americans of whom only a little more than one third (34.8 percent) had spoken English only prior to school entrance.[3] In other words, in this respect they resembled Indian children. They scored lowest of all non-Indian children, but higher than all Indian children in the area. The Coombs team raised but did not attempt to answer a speculative question as to whether these Mexican American children "exercised less acculturation influence on their Indian classmates in the public schools than did their non-Indian contemporaries in the other areas."[4]

High achievers tended to be high aspirants to further education. An inconsistent trend was observed for whites to aspire higher during the lower grades and Indian children by the 11th and 12th grades.[1]

Greenberg, who had taught for two years in a Navajo school, studied integration problems among the Navajo.[2] He observed the barest minimum of special measures to prepare for receiving Navajo children in the public schools. "In many instances," reported Greenberg, "the school boards and superintendents were of the opinion that mere acceptance of Navajo children into their school system implied equality of education."[3] Greenberg warned against a well-meaning disposition to lower standards for Navajo children. He observed: "If the Navajo pupil succeeds within the accepted standards, he is more likely to be able to make his way both inside and outside of the Indian world."[4]

Dilling made a study of Indians in Ontario.[5] In May, 1963, he administered modified standard achievement tests to 1,459 Indian pupils. His major finding follows: "... Integrated Indian pupils achieved higher than Indian pupils in Indian schools only on the vocabulary and computation tests. On the comprehension test, there was an unexpected difference favoring Indian pupils in Indian schools over integrated Indian pupils."[6]

Brant and Hobart contrasted Danish and Canadian policies toward Eskimo education.[7] The Danish policy in Greenland is characterized as "cultural receptivity" and is marked by flexibility and tentativeness. The Canadian policy is characterized as "ethnocentrism" and is marked by "rigidity and crash-program mentality of certainty."[1] Brant and Hobart write:[2]

> Among Greenlàndic Eskimos there appears to be a high degree of maintenance of feelings of group self-esteem and a positive valuation of most aspects of traditional culture. Danes and things Danish are not accepted wholesale, mechanically, slavishly; ways of doing, attitudes, and motivational patterns are not, in a blanket manner, regarded as good by Eskimos because of their association with the Danish way of life.

The relations between Dane and Eskimo reflect cultural difference rather than cultural hierarchy.

In Canada, however:[3]

> The exclusive use of English as the language of instruction among children understanding this language little or not at all, by teachers knowing nothing of the Eskimo language, creates multiple difficulties. The first year to two years of classes are given over almost entirely to teaching English. The tendency to use Eskimo amongst themselves is discouraged if not prohibited.

Many teachers of Eskimos gain satisfaction from the "mask-like smiling faces" of Eskimo children as evidences of a cheerful and happy adjustment. Far from it, according to Brant and Hobart. They explain that Eskimo parents, "in accord with tradition, commonly counsel their children to contain their emotions lest they make the white people at school feel unhappy."[4]

Griffen studied the Southern Ute people in southwestern Colorado.[5] She sought to discover whether a child's family structure had an influence on his ability to learn in an integrated school. She found that "the grade level at which a student does his best work correlates with the structure of his family orientation, and that the more extended the family is beyond nuclear, the more deferred will be the peak school performance achieved by the individual socialized therein."[6] Griffen had studied Ute, Anglo, and Mexican-American children in a school in Ignacio, Colorado, near Durango.

Bryde studied the Oglala Sioux at Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.[1] A review of I Q and achievement scores of the youngsters there revealed a distinctive pattern. During the first three years of school on the reservation, the Sioux student is normal in intelligence but quite far from the norm on achievement tests; at the end of the third grade, the achievement lag is one-half grade to one-and-one-half grades. In fourth grade, the Sioux child suddenly enters a "golden age" of higher-than-norm achievement, which lasts until seventh grade or eighth grade. At that point, a sudden drop in achievement occurs, and by twelfth grade, "most Indian groups are as far as two years behind in achievement."[2] Bryde described this sharp reversal as the "cross-over phenomenon." He hypothesized that "the impact of the Sioux-white value conflicts, occurring primarily during the period of adolescence, creates in the Sioux student adjustment and personality deviations which, in turn, hamper achievement."[3]

Bryde studied three groups of Indian students, all attending schools on a reservation, and white students who attended public schools in small towns adjacent to the reservations:

164	Indian students who were eighth graders in eight schools on Pine Ridge Reservation.
159	Indian students who were ninth graders in two high schools on Pine Ridge Reservation.
92	Indian students who were seniors at two high schools on Pine Ridge and adjacent Rosebud Reservations.
415	

76	White students who were eighth graders in small-town public schools.
126	White students who were ninth graders in small-town public schools.
202	

All children filled out the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI).

Analysis of the inventory replies showed Indian students to be significantly higher than whites in "social alienation, emotional alienation, self-alienation, social isolation, anxiety and depressions."[1] It is not clear whether, as Bryde states, the Indian students have a higher need to achieve.[2] A summary figure shows no significant difference between Indian and white need to achieve;[3] yet, separate figures show Indian boys and girls with a higher need to achieve than their white counterparts.[4]

Indian twelfth graders are a select group; sixty percent of Indian students drop out before than time. On MMPI scores, the twelfth graders "show themselves to be more comfortable with the world, more self-assured and self-confident."[5]

Bryde, then, views the educational plight of the Sioux student as the outcome of a culture conflict, with serious personality consequences. This conclusion is closely in line with a recent federal government report:[6]

> For some time, determined efforts were made to destroy the many cultures of the Indian on the ground that they were major deterrents to full membership in our society. Schools were the institutions charged with this destructive function. As a result, a few Indians made the traumatic adjustment but many more did not.

Bryde has proposed a new curriculum for Indian education which aims at building confidence in the Indian culture.[1]

II. Mexican-Americans

During the 1930's and 1940's, many Master's theses about Mexican-American education were written, especially at the University of Southern California. Some are little more than simple questionnaire studies but a larger number contain potentially valuable statistical material which should be consolidated, if possible, and reworked. This has not been done in the present work.

Schroff studied teacher-parent relations in San Bernardino, California, and documented a wide gulf between the two.[2] Farmer studied school segregation in Venture County, California.[3] His subjects were 619 children, of whom 290 were Mexican-Americans and 329 were Anglos; both segregated and non-segregated schools were used. Farmer stated that families of both groups of children were socioeconomically very comparable. He found that "pupils' attitudes toward the other race in recreation was more favorable in non-segregated schools than in segregated schools"[4] In the non-segregated schools, social distance between Mexican-American and Anglo was lesser. Pratt's study of Colorado ended with a series of up-to-date recommendations on the importance of integrating at the earliest possible grade.[5] Cornelius studied the comparative effectiveness of certain curricular changes in La Jolla School near Placentia, California; the results were inconclusive.[6]

King's study of Bakersfield, California, found that a single school -- Lincoln -- enrolled nearly three-quarters of all the Negro students and somewhat more than one third of the Mexican-American students in the city.[1] While the latter were considerably less segregated than Negroes, except for sports they had little to do with Anglos.

Calderon, Goldner, and De Hoyos studied Mexican-Americans in small and medium-size northern cities: Des Moines, St. Paul, and Lansing, Michigan.[2]

Calderon's study of one hundred Mexican-American families in West Des Moines is interesting for various cultural attitudes. She reported that all the families with children attending high school "are sincere in the desire that their children receive an education in order to avoid the suffering that they have endured, and to be equipped to make good and easier livings."[3] One informant complained of the egocentricity of Americans; one evidence of this was the fact that "they never omit the 'I', as is done in Spanish."[4] Another criticized the Americans because "they are so anxious to make money and to get ahead that they do not even have time to give a friendly greeting to a person, as do well-educated people."[5] Speaking of the families as a whole, according to Calderon, "they consider it is a waste of time to send a child to school for the first years, here, because they are required only to play, which they can do at home."[6] One informant stated that according to a friend in Mason City, Iowa, schools Mexican-American and Anglo children were placed in separate rooms in the same building.[7]

In Goldner's study of two generations of Mexican-American males in St. Paul, formal education became the great divide between generations. "The trend," Goldner reported, "is for the generations to hold increased educational and professional aspirations for their sons as they become increasingly urban; 'grandfathers' choosing education and the professions eight percent of the time, the 'fathers' about sixty percent of the time, and the 'sons' eighty-four percent."[1] So great was the generational gap because of American schooling that "already some grandfathers are in the awkward situation of not being able to speak with their grandchildren, who know no Spanish."[2] With greater job mobility as a result of educational attainments, however, the youngest generation is meeting with much more anti-Mexican prejudice. The older generation did not constitute any real competition to Anglos.

De Hoyos found that "school integration ... provides [Mexican-Americans] many new types of social interaction with the dominant group."[3] His sample of 91 Mexican-American boys, ages 15 to 18, strongly aspired to a higher occupation than the one held by their father. Acculturation, held De Hoyos, was proceeding much faster in Lansing than in the Southwest where it was being actively resisted by Mexican-Americans.[4]

Ulibarri explored the sensitivity of teachers to cultural differences among students.[5] He selected 100 teachers who had taught Anglo, Indian American, and Mexican-American children; twenty controls were also selected who had taught only one of these groups of children. The results showed very clearly that there is "a general lack of teacher sensitivity to and awareness of socio-cultural differences. ... "[1] The teachers also demonstrated a surprising unawareness of differential educational opportunities being offered children in the three ethnic groups. For example, "teachers believe that the school is meeting the psychological needs of children equally well for all three ethnic groups" and "teachers in general think that all the groups are achieving at grade level."[2] Rubel studied Mexiquito, an urban neighborhood in Weslaco, Texas, in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.[3] He found strictly segregated schools for Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Negroes. Three fourths of the sixth graders (mostly Mexican-American) dropped out of school at that point. While Mexican-Americans have historically been excluded from the professions in Weslaco, since World War II veterans returned, the situation has changed somewhat. Taba described a junior high school in southern California which both Negroes and Mexican-Americans attended. Ability grouping, she reported, resulted in increased social distance among the children.[4] In a comparative study of creativity, Schmadel, Merrifield, and Johnson reported that "there is ... no indication of differences in test performance attributable to ethnic background, to any ... predictively useful degree; there is a hint that, other things being equal, Mexican-Americans may tend to perform slightly better on figural tests than do Anglo-Americans."[5] The study was based on test responses by 314 sixth graders in the San Gabriel School District.

Heller studied 165 Mexican-American male high school seniors in Los Angeles.[1] Her primary interest was in the occupational ambitions of the young men and the means they envisioned for achieving the goals. Mexican-American aspirations were very like those of Anglos, especially when social class was equated. The former, however, have considerably more realistic conceptions of what they expect to get.

Heller divided her sample into two groups:

98	boys in two predominantly Mexican-American schools (segregated)
67	boys in six predominantly Anglo-American schools (integrated)

Aspiring to non-manual occupations were 64 percent of the latter and 49 percent of the former.[2] The two are alike, however, in educational expectations. But, declared Heller, "whether the Mexican-Americans will move toward the occupational distribution of the population at large depends, among other things, on whether their children will break out of the school ghettos they are now in."[3]

Heller notes that a fundamental reorientation toward formal education has taken place in the Mexican-American community in Los Angeles since 1945: "The real breakthrough in the pattern of Mexican-American non-mobility was made after the war by the returning G.I.'s. When they started enrolling in college, they were referred to in their community as locos, crazy."[4] Previously, such attempts had been regarded as futile. Heller also states that the establishment of a junior college in East Lost Angeles had a significant effect.[5]

If Mexican-American youth do not as yet match their aspirations with actual preparation for professional careers, this is a note of realism, for such careers are in fact not readily available to them. Mexican-American I Q scores are sharply lower than those of Anglo-Americans; when students are equated for social class, however, the gap closes significantly but the difference is still substantial.[1] I Q scores of Mexican-American students were found by Heller to vary significantly (at the level of .001) with size of family; the smaller the family, the higher the I Q. Anglo families being smaller on the average, their I Q's were higher.[2]

Heller probed certain social values traditionally classified as Mexican and others as Anglo-American. She found in the area of social values that in general: "Mexican-American high school seniors ... largely resemble their Anglo-American peers, especially when the factor of class is controlled."[3] What happened to the Mexican cultural values of defending family honor and of preferring to smooth over disagreements rather than effecting a blunt confrontation? Heller writes:[4]

> ... A much larger proportion of Mexican-American boys in the "integrated" schools (74 percent) than in the "non-integrated" schools (55 percent) answered that they prefer to be the kind of person who "never lets an insult to his or his family's honor go by. ... Among the ... [integrated], only 42 percent but among the ... [segregated] 65 percent expressed preference for pointing out real issues to facilitate intelligent arguing over disagreements.

As for belief in individualism and orientation toward the future, some interesting contrasts emerged.

Significantly (.05) more Mexican-Americans than Anglo-Americans "chose to give up the pleasures of the present in order to assure the future."[1] Both groups have about the same order of orientation to the future. Both are devoted to individuality, but not to the point of risking social isolation; the Mexican-American boys showed this tendency more than the Anglo-Americans.

In Heller's view, "the school socializes the Mexican-American boy in mobility values but fails to socialize him in mobility-inducing behavior."[2] The capacities of Mexican-American youth are left underdeveloped by the schools. Teachers simply do not expect Mexican-Americans to learn as much as they expect of Anglo-American children. Indeed, according to Heller, the well-meaning but misdirected teacher "is more likely to be concerned with doing something so that the Mexican-American child 'should not feel inadequate' instead of doing something so that the child would stop being inadequate."[3]

Parsons studied the two worlds of the Mexican-American and the Anglo in a small town of 1,800 located 150 miles south of San Francisco.[4] Mexican-Americans make up 55 percent of the population of "Guadalupe."

The family is the dominant relationship in the life of the Mexican-American child. Paramount are the obligations between parents and children and between brothers and sisters. Children are strictly supervised until they are twelve or thirteen; it is largely for this reason that Mexican-American children attend few school functions. Many of these cultural facts of life are unknown to Anglo teachers. As Parsons reported: "What some teachers have pointed out to the researcher as 'cliques' turned out to be groups of brothers and sisters and cousins who play and eat together because that is what is expected of them, by each other and by their parents."[1] What is family solidarity to some appears as ethnic cleavage to the outside observer.

But that ethnic cleavage is all but complete in Guadelupe. Except for a single teacher in the town, "not a single Anglo had ever been inside a Mexican home."[2] In every aspect of the town's life -- making a living, church-going, recreation, and more -- the Mexican-American feels his separateness and his subordination. The Mexican-American accepts the subordinate role utterly.

The school is a typical Guadelupe institution. While Mexican-Americans make up only 57 percent of enrollment, the principal and teachers -- all Anglo -- over-estimate the percentage. Most teachers are convinced Mexican-American children are less intelligent than Anglo children. Parsons checked I Q scores for both groups and found the following distribution of mean scores:[3]

Grade	Anglo	Mexican-American
3	97	91
4	110	92
5	111	104
6	111	99
7	104	97
8	97	95

Ability-grouping is practiced to an extreme degree with the high-ability classes being almost entirely Anglo. A teacher explained to Parsons that such classes are kept as "small as possible because we feel that the brighter pupils deserve a chance to get as much as they can out of school without being held back by the kids who are dull or just lazy or don't care."[1]

Parsons sat in on numerous classes and compiled an extensive log of teacher practices that illustrated the everyday reality of ethnic cleavage. Anglo "helpers" were used by teachers; no Mexican-American children were ever so used. Very often and systematically teachers ignored Mexican-American childrens' hands in favor of calling on Anglos. Often, while Mexican-American children were reciting, teachers interrupted them to listen to an Anglo child. Teachers related very informally with Anglo children, inquiring about family affairs and the like; with Mexican-American children they were very strict. Teachers went out of their way to praise and encourage Anglo children while just as regularly criticizing Mexican-American children. Frequently, teachers explained to Parsons that preferential treatment for Anglo children was necessary because they were going to grow up to lead Guadalupe and they might as well get used to it early.[2]

Parsons administered sociometric tests in February, 1965. Anglos expressed stronger self-preferences than did the Mexican-Americans. Anglos looked toward other Anglos for prestige while Mexican-American children looked to both groups. Mexican-Americans, however, were more interested in Anglo prestige than Anglo companionship.[3] In various ways the relative self-depreciation of Mexican-Americans can be seen:[4]

> The Mexican pupils ... considered themselves to be about as attractive as the Anglo pupils. When choosing persons who are thought to be unattractive, however, the Mexicans tended to choose in their own group more than among Anglos. ... 94% of the Anglos and 80% of the Mexicans chose Anglos as being "smart," and ... 88% of the Anglos and 70% of the Mexicans chose Mexicans as being dumb. ... Anglo pupils generally consider the Mexican pupils to be lazy and not to care, a consideration which, interestingly enough, is reflected in the choices made by the Mexican pupils themselves.

Acceptance of social subordination is clear throughout.

The school of Guadalupe, then, is a very strong reflection of the valuing of the Anglos in the town. Parsons broadens the applicability of his portrait: "Where, as in the case of Southwestern communities like Guadalupe, the social structure exhibits caste-like features based on ethnic differentiation, the school as one of the 'most vital of all institutions', will be operated by and in the interests of the dominant group."[1] Parsons' study is outstanding for its realism, its intimate knowledge of the plainest detail of everyday life, and for its clear conception of power in relation to education. We may be permitted perhaps the observation that the "Guadalupes" of America, while still numerous, are distinctly becoming less important to the rapidly urbanizing Mexican-American. (In 1967, 175,000 Mexican-Americans lived in East Los Angeles.)[2] One hopes that an approach like Parsons' will be applied to understanding ethnic cleavage in the great cities of the country.

III. Conclusions

Many of the educational disabilities burdened by Indian-Americans and Mexican-Americans are shared by Negro-Americans. It is important to realize that belonging to an ethnic minority in America and being poor besides creates a common plight. Many parallels can be seen in studies of self-concept, response to desegregation, and rising aspirations. If we add to poverty a persistent cultural segregation, the common plight becomes clearer. The urban Negro ghetto is re-enacted, with even greater injury, on the isolated remotely-controlled Indian reservation. The factor of a "foreign" language -- Spanish -- becomes, instead of a link, a barrier. Yet, more constructive directions are seen as realistic through research that taps the potential of isolated minorities to live fruitfully with other children.

FOOTNOTES

Page 160

1. John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, Education of the American Population, A 1960 Census Monograph (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967) p. 151.

Page 161

1. John C. Scott, Jr., Race and Culture Contact in Southeastern Alaska: A Study of the Assimilation and Acculturation of the Wrangell Tlingit and White, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1953.

2. Ibid., p. 263.

3. Ibid., p. 633.

4. Ibid., footnote, p. 15.

5. Kenneth E. Anderson, E. Gordon Collister, and Carl E. Ladd, The Educational Achievement of Indian Children (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1953).

Page 162

1. Ibid., p. 47.

2. L. Madison Coombs, Ralph E. Kron, E. Gordon Collister, and Kenneth E. Anderson, The Indian Child Goes to School. A Study of Interracial Differences (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1958).

3. Ibid., p. 5.

Page 163

1. Ibid., p. 133.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 105.

4. Ibid.

Page 164

1. Ibid., p. 135.

2. Norman C. Greenberg, Administrative Problems Related to Integration of Navajo Indians in Public Education, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963.

3. Ibid., p. 92.

4. Ibid., p. 100.

5. H. J. Dilling, "Educational Achievement and Social Acceptance of Indian Pupils Integrated in Non-Indian Schools of Southern Ontario," Ontario Journal of Educational Research, Autumn, 1965.

6. Ibid., p. 51.

7. C. S. Brant and C. W. Hobart, "Sociocultural Conditions and Consequences of Native Education in the Arctic: A Cross-National Comparison," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November, 18-21, 1965.

Page 165

1. A somewhat more favorable interpretation can be found in J. Roby Kidd, "Education of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo," Integrated Education, December, 1966 - January, 1967.

2. Brant and Hobart, pp. 5 - 6.

3. Ibid., p. 8.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

5. Joyce Griffen, Family Structure and School Performance: A Comparative Study of Students From Three Ethnic Backgrounds in an Integrated School, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Anthropology. University of Pennsylvania, 1965. University Microfilms No. 65-13,334.

6. Ibid., p. 2.

Page 166

1. John F. Bryde, S. J., The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict (Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770: Holy Rosary Mission, 1966).

2. Ibid., p. 52.

3. Ibid., p. 53.

Page 167

1. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 83 and 88.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

6. President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *The People Left Behind* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1967), p. 51.

Page 168

1. See, also, William A. Brophy and Sophie D. Aberle (compr.), "Education," chapter 5 in The Indian. *America's Unfinished Business* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966).

2. Ruth Schroff, *A Study of Social Distance Between Mexican Parents and American Teachers in San Bernardino, California,* unpublished M.A. thesis in Sociology, University of Southern California, 1936.

3. William A. Farmer, *The Influence of Segregation of Mexican and American Children Upon the Development of Social Attitudes*, unpublished M.A. thesis in Education, University of Southern California, 1937.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

5. Philip S. Pratt, *A Comparison of the School Achievement and Socio-Economic Background of Mexican and White Children in a Delta Colorado Elementary School*, unpublished M.A. thesis in Education, University of Southern California, 1938.

6. John Scott Cornelius, *The Effects of Certain Changes of Curriculum and Methods on the School Achievement of Mexican Children in a Segregated School*, unpublished M.S. thesis in Education, University of Southern California, 1941.

Page 169

1. John Randle King, *An Inquiry Into the Status of Mexican Segregation in Metropolitan Bakersfield,* unpublished M.A. thesis, Claremont Graduate School, 1946, p. 19.

2. Judith Batista Y Calderon, *A Study of Counter-Prejudice in a Mexican-Spanish Community in the Surroundings of Des Moines*, unpublished M.A. thesis, Drake University, 1948; Norman S. Goldner,

The Mexican in the Northern Urban Area: A Comparison of Two Generations, unpublished M. A. dissertation in Sociology, University of Minnesota, 1959; and Arturo De Hoyos, Occupational and Educational Levels of Aspiration of Mexican-American Youth, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Michigan State University, 1961. University Microfilm No. 61-2687.

3. Calderon, p. 16.

4. Ibid., p. 27.

5. Ibid., p. 28.

6. Ibid., p. 68.

7. Ibid., p. 55.

Page 170

1. Goldner, p. 88.

2. Ibid., p. 106.

3. De Hoyos, p. 13.

4. Ibid., p. 116.

5. Horacio Ulibarri, Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms, unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959. University Microfilm No. 60-1261.

Page 171

1. Ibid., p. 90.

2. Ibid., pp. 70 and 84.

3. Arthur J. Rubel, Social Life of Urban Mexican-Americans, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of North Carolina, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-3561. See, also, Rubel, Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1966).

4. Hilda Taba, School Culture. Studies of Participation and Leadership (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1955), p. 95.

5. Elnora Schmadel, Phil Merrifield, and Henry Johnson, "The Performance of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Pupils on the Minnesota Test of Creative Thinking," unpublished paper read to the CASPP annual conference, March 20, 1964.

Page 172

1. Celia S. Heller, Ambitions of Mexican-American Youth. Goals and Means of Mobility of High School Seniors, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Columbia University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-11296.

2. Ibid., p. 98.

3. Ibid., p. 101.

4. Ibid., p. 258.

5. Ibid., p. 117.

Page 173

1. Ibid., p. 155.

2. Ibid., p. 164.

3. Ibid., p. 208.

4. Ibid., pp. 197 and 217.

Page 174

1. Ibid., p. 228.

2. Ibid., p. 244.

3. Ibid., p. 246 (emphasis in original).

4. Theodore W. Parsons, Jr., Ethnic Cleavage in a California School, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, Stanford University, 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-2602.

Page 175

1. Ibid., p. 139.

2. Ibid., p. 207.

3. Ibid., p. 264.

Page 176

1. *Ibid.*, p. 271; see, also, p. 281.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 296-297 and *passim*.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 355.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 361, 363, and 368.

Page 177

1. *Ibid.*, p. 391.

2. Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., in U. S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, *Bilingual Education Hearings,* II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 427.

CHAPTER VI

TWO FEDERAL REPORTS

This Chapter is devoted to an analysis of two studies conducted by federal agencies: (1) the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, by the U. S. Office of Education, and (2) Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.[1]

I. The Equal Educational Opportunities Survey

During congressional debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, virtually no attention was paid Section 402 requiring that

> The Commissioner [of Education] shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

In the final design of the study, the factor of religion was omitted. In July, 1966, two full years after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the U. S. Office of Education published a single volume reporting the principal results of its survey;[2] a second volume was released with extensive statistical materials.[3] The report documented extensive inequality of educational opportunity. In the present work, however, we shall restrict our attention to material relating to possible learning effect of desegregation. Although the co-directors of the study were James S.

Coleman and Ernest Q. Campbell, the project was very much a collective one and so we refer to it as the Office of Education study.

Let us examine the major findings in the same order in which we discussed parallel subject matter in the preceding chapters. The general order of topics is: (A) desegregation and achievement; (B) aspiration and self-concept; (C) relations with other students and teachers; (D) role of the family; and (E) non-Negro minorities.

A. Desegregation and achievement.

The findings on this subject are as follows:[1]

> 1. ... As the proportion white in a school increases, the achievement of students in each racial group increases.
>
> 2. ... This relationship increases as grade in school increases.
>
> 3. The higher achievement of all racial and ethnic groups in schools with greater proportions of white students is largely, perhaps wholly, related to effects associated with the student body's educational background and aspirations rather than with better facilities and curriculum.
>
> 4. ... Average test performance [for Negroes] increases as the proportion of white classmates increases. ...
>
> 5. Those students who first entered desegregated schools in the early grades do generally show slightly higher average scores than the students who first came to desegregated schools in later grades.

Each of these findings had been reached earlier by at least one researcher.

B. Aspiration and self-concept.

Aspiration, interest in school, and "motivation" were found to be especially high among Negro students.[1] Both Negro and white were found to have equally high self-esteem.[2] Related to the latter is the pupil's sense of control of his environment. Negroes and other minorities ranked lower than whites on this measure.[3] These three elements were, according to the researchers, found to interact:[4]

> For each [ethnic group], as the proportion white in the school increases, the child's sense of control of environment increases, and his self-concept decreases. ... The parents' desires for the child's further education have the largest unique contribution to positive self-concept and a sense of control of environment.

"Sense of control of environment" was measured by three yardsticks: (1) the respondent's belief in hard work rather than in good luck for success; (2) feeling that others are not getting in one's way when one tries to get ahead; and (3) a belief that "people like me have a chance to be successful in life." Whites scored significantly higher on the first measure and less so on the latter two. Sense of control was not treated in any of the research previsouly reviewed in the present work. However, in Meketon's study, described in Chapter III, Negro children who desegregated school "C" demonstrated a high sense of control of reality and yet experienced a higher sense of self-esteem than other Negro children who remained in an all-Negro school.[5] In Singer's study, the highest achieving Negro students in a desegregated school had the highest self-regard. In any case, the Office of Education researchers themselves suggest that the above interrelationship between desegregation, self-concept, and sense of control may not be an effect of integration, and that in any case the relations involved are small.

C. Relation with Students and Teachers.

The Office of Education study does not deal systematically with the quality of relationships between Negro and white students. Some of a series of case studies of desegregation recall earlier studies. This is especially so for the case of the University of Delaware.[1]

The study reached several findings on the importance of teachers in understanding achievement differentials between schools and students. Perhaps the most significant of these was the following:[2]

> The apparent effect of average teacher characteristics for children in a given group is directly related to the "sensitivity" of the group to the school environment. ... Good teachers matter more for children from minority groups which have educationally deficient backgrounds. It suggests as well that for any groups whether minority or not, the effect of good teachers is greatest upon the children who suffer most educational disadvantage in their background, and that a given investment in upgrading teacher quality will have most effect on achievement in underprivileged areas.

It will be recalled that Geisel also pointed out the more personal meaning school and the teachers have for the Negro child.[3] Katz, as we saw in Chapter IV, supplies a theoretical framework within which it is possible to view the dynamics of the Office of Education finding.

D. Role of the Family.

The Office of Education survey regards the school-to-school variations in student achievement to be explained principally by "variations in family backgrounds of the entering student bodies."[1] From 10 to 25 percent of variances in individual achievement can be accounted for by family background factors.[2] As the child progresses in school, objective family background factors recede in importance; included among these are size and intactness of family, reading material in home, parents' education and the like. Subjective family background factors, however, become increasingly important to the school child; such factors include parents' interest in school and their educational aspirations for their children. It was inferred that for some reason Negro parents are not succeeding in translating their high interest in school progress "into practices that support the child's achievement."[3] (There was no effort to discover whether this difficulty was related in any way to the school's role.) The study apparently did not inquire into the aliency of subjective family background factors under varying degrees of desegregation. Also, the study did not examine the general relation of the family to student desegregation.

E. Non-Negro Minorities.

Data were collected and presented for Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indian Americans, Oriental Americans, as well as Negroes and whites. All basic Tables include data on all ethnic groups. (A separate publication consolidates much of the data on Mexican-Americans.[1]) In the study, numerous comparisons are made among the minorities. Unfortunately, no benchmark for measuring change is presented and so it is not possible to judge the direction and pace of any changes that may be implicit in the data.

F. The Importance of Desegregation.

The study found intra-school differences in achievement to be much larger than inter-school differences. From five percent (Oriental Americans) to thirty-one percent (Indian Americans) of the total difference in achievement can be attributed to differences between schools. For most school children the range is around ten (white) to twenty (Negro) percent.[2] The rest originates in factors outside all schools and factors entirely within individual schools. The former factors are those related to family background; the latter, to a combination of in-school factors: (a) characteristics of the student body, (b) school facilities and curriculum, (c) teachers' characteristics, and (d) attitudes of students.

As we saw above, the study attributes from 10 to 25 percent of achievement test score variation to family background factors. Turning to factors within the schools, the study observes that "attributes of other students account for far more variation in the achievement of minority group children than do any attributes of school facilities and slightly more than do attributes of staff."[3] Earlier, we listed the study's findings as to the relationship of achievement and integration. The relationships were sizable and significant. While they were reduced in size when the socioeconomic status of students was controlled, "the [students'] performance in integrated schools and in schools integrated longer remains higher. Thus, although the differences are small, and although the degree of integration within the school is not known, there is evidently, even in the short run, an effect of school integration on the reading and mathematics achievement of Negro pupils."[1] A distinctly modest achievement effect is thus attributed to desegregation.

G. Criticisms of the Office of Education Study.

The Equal Educational Opportunity Study is the largest, most criticized, defended, and interpreted study of its kind.[2] At the same time, the debate around it goes on almost completely isolated from previous research in the field. The best-informed popular discussions of the study proceed as though either the previous research is not worth reviewing or does not even exist. But the report of the study itself does hardly more than this. It cites only two specific studies (Katz, 1964, and Wilson, 1959, both described in earlier chapters). In addition, the report occasionally refers vaguely to "previous research," when it approves, and to "writers," when it disapproves. Only two participants in the debate have used other research and named it -- Pettigrew and Katz. For the rest, they seem committed to the idea that the issues dealt with in the study stand or fall on the findings of the study. This is far from the case.

Following is a list of the principal criticisms of the Office of Education study that have appeared thus far in the literature.

1. Methodological

   (a) Failed to study and evaluate roles of administration and of the organized community. (Gordon)

   (b) Studied less important school factors such as facilities, offerings, and teacher qualifications instead of more consequential factors such as "pupil-teacher interaction, teacher expectation, classroom climate, pupil-pupil interaction, and the types and demands of the learning experiences available." (Gordon)

   (c) " . . . Its thoughtlessness is a function of a certain degree of mindless empiricism and often patent lack of 'acquaintance with' the objects of study; these lead to instance of naive operationalism and a tendency to swallow factitions and blatantly nonsensical results all too gullibly." (Pfautz)

2. Procedural

   (a) The sample:

      (1) Is unrepresentative of very large cities . (Sewell, Bowles and Levin)

      (2) Is inadequate because of the high non-response rate from school systems and on student questionnaires. (Bowles and Levin)

   (b) Coding of questionnaire responses was poorly done. (Bowles and Levin)

   (c) Linear regression technique was ill-adapted to problems studied. (Bowles and Levin)

   (d) Socioeconomic status was not effectively controlled. (Nichols)

3. Substantive

   (a) Study underestimated actual inequality of educational opportunity. (Gordon)

   (b) Per-pupil expenditures are far more unequal than the Study suggests. (Bowles and Levin)

   (c) The integration-effect on achievement is actually a social-class effect. (Bowles and Levin, Nichols)

(d) The school-effect on achievement is much less than the study indicates. (Sewell)

Following are some comments on these criticisms:

1. Methodological Criticisms.

These criticisms are judgments about "what might have been." Gordon's points are extremely well-taken. The study utilized traditional and manipulable categories. At the same time it shied away from expressing an opinion about the quality of schooling other than by reference to achievement scores of individual students. The schools, indeed, come out of all this in so neutral and helpless a stance that one wonders where future change is to originate. Pfautz seems to be arguing with the field of educational research; as for lack of acquaintance with the objects of study, this was evidently true in at least the matter of per-pupil expenditures, discussed below.

2. Procedural Criticisms.

The weakness of the sample is all too evident. Let us take the problem of inadequate coverage. Very likely the sample is lopsided in its failure to include many of the largest cities. As a result, those school systems with the largest Negro student bodies are, in fact, underrepresented. The evidence for this is indirect. Sewell points out that the big cities are the locus of the greatest between-school differences in achievement; accordingly, their omission could well have created the appearance of small between-school differences.

The defective sample cannot be charged to the Office of Education. A number of large city school systems refused to participate; an organized campaign was conducted by school officials to discourage participation. According to unverified press reports, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, Buffalo, Syracuse, Long Beach, Columbus, Cincinnati, and Boston were among the non-participants. James Coleman, co-director of the study, observed that eight cities in which the NAACP had filed a suit against the school board refused to participate in the testing. "School superintendents," Coleman said, "have become much more sensitive about these kinds of problems."[1]

Another line of criticism can draw on several items in the study that indicate a condition in which city school systems enrolling numerous ghetto children were omitted. In a special compilation, Mayeske, Weinfeld, and Beaton report that fewer than two percent of the teachers responding to item 35 on the teacher's questionnaire were substitutes. (In Chicago, the figure is now nearly twenty-five percent; in Washington, D.C., it is over thirty percent.) In the main report, it is stated that "on the whole, Negro pupils are not instructed by less experienced teachers, nor by those newer to the current school" and that "faculties are somewhat more stable in schools attended by Negroes."[2] However representative these conditions are in some places, they are most unlike conditions in large urban centers.

Katz contends that socioeconomic factors were substantially controlled so that the report's claims on this count are defensible.

3. Substantive Criticisms.

Let us examine the matter of per-pupil expenditures. Bowles and Levin charge that "the measure used in the Report was an average of expenditure per student within an entire school district. School to school differences within a district ... were simply ignored."[1] Thus, a bias was said to be imparted to the data and the lower expenditures for disadvantaged schools were therefore said to be understated. For verification, the reader is referred by Bowles and Levin to a recent study by Jesse Burkhead as well as an older one by Patricia C. Sexton.[2] In fact, however, Burkhead does not verify the generalization by Bowles and Levin. Instead, he states: "The Chicago resource allocation patterns for public schools do not follow the patterns revealed in Patricia Cayo Sexton's study of Large City [Detroit], where she found that the upper-income schools were favored in terms of all-important categories of inputs."[3] (Burkhead used Atlanta and Chicago budget data as his principal evidence.)

Nevertheless, it would appear that both the Office of Education study and the Bowles-Levin critique suffer from the same defect: They assume that budget allocations and expenditures are the same. It is the rare large-city school system that publishes a detailed record of expenditures as against allocations. Even if the study had used school-by-school, rather than district-wide, allocations, an additional measure of realism would have been gained. Many problems, however, would still remain.

Data about teacher salaries, the single largest item in any school budget and thus in per-pupil expenditures, were collected on an individual-teacher basis (question number 32 of the Teacher's Questionnaire) as well as on a system-wide basis (question number 36B and 41B of the Superintendent's Questionnaire). Presumably, if the study used the former source, then -- according to the logic of Bowles and Levin -- important school to school differences should have been demonstrated.

Because results were not reported for single schools or subgroups of schools, one cannot easily decide the matter. However, the study declared:[1]

> When we compare Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Indian, and Oriental-American students with whites in their same counties, there are few differences. Most of the relationships approximate those between whites and Negroes. In teachers' salary, there are no differences by race of student that exceeded $100 annually. ...

How can this apparent equality be accounted for?

First, by the entire survey's underrepresentation of large school systems in which very sizable salary differences are allocated in the budget to various types of schools. A large school system with one-quarter substitutes will have to allocate lower salaries to those schools where the substitutes teach. In the large cities, this means especially schools in which Negro students predominate. This fact simply does not surface in the Office of Education study.

Second, the study confuses prices with costs. Salaries are prices, but costs of teacher include prices other than salaries alone. Nowadays, for example, fringe benefits are an important non-wage supplement. The survey collected information in this kind of expenditure from superintendents -- although it was not designated as what part represented teacher fringes -- but not from individual teachers. What is the magnitude of fringe benefits and how do these play a role in inequality of educational opportunity? Recently, an experienced official in the New York City school system declared:[1]

> A beginning substitute teacher costs $6,200 plus 7% in fringe benefits for a total cost of $6,634. A teacher on maximum costs $12,600 plus 30% in fringe benefits for a total cost of $16,380. ... This fact would be unimportant if teachers at different levels of service, licensing and educational preparation were distributed equally among the schools. ... The fact is that these levels are unequally distributed throughout the school system. It is a matter of common knowledge ... that the schools for poor children have fewer experienced teachers and more substitutes.

Let us examine these figures.

Suppose one school were to be staffed entirely with substitutes at beginning pay, and another with teachers at maximum step on the salary schedule; assume two schools employing 35 teachers and serving 1,000 students each. Total teacher costs in the first school would be $232,190 or $232.19 per pupil; in the second school, teacher costs would be $573,330 or $573.33 per pupil. While few, if any, schools in reality duplicate these figures, a number approximate them. Interestingly, the author of the above quotation states that to the best of his knowledge no study of actual staff costs has been made in New York City. Lacking such studies, a cloud of dense unreality envelopes much discussion and research on inequalities of educational opportunity.

A final comment on quantity of school expenditure. In 1960, Sexton found, "Chicago was spending slightly more than $300 per pupil per year for instruction in the elementary schools."[2] (The figure is not greatly different today.) "Obviously," she added, "you cannot come within a thousand miles of giving an adequate education to a slum child for $300 a year. ... It is a travesty to think we can." In 1967, a federal court in Washington, D. C., found the city's school board in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment in part on evidence that a per pupil expenditure differential of $100 existed between predominantly Negro and predominantly white schools; virtually all the differential was shown to consist of teacher-salary differences.[1]

Gordon's methodological comment bears directly on the matter just reviewed: "School factors may have been found to be of relatively modest importance for all pupils not because what the schools can do is not crucial but because ... [the study] did not look at what the schools actually do." Certain additional substantive criticisms of the study will be dealt with in the latter half of this chapter.

In summary, the Office of Education study verified once more research findings that had already been established repeatedly that social class integration benefited achievement and that, to a lesser extent, racial desegregation had the same kind of effect. Undoubtedly, the report spoke ambiguously on the exact interrelationship of class and race. The report is less useful as a representation of everyday reality in America's schoolrooms.

II. The Racial Isolation Study

In November, 1965, eight months before the Office of Education study was completed, President Johnson requested the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights to prepare a report on remedies for racial isolation in the schools inasmuch as "it has become apparent that such isolation presents serious barriers to quality education." In February, 1967, the report was completed and entitled Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Thomas F. Pettigrew served as a chief consultant for the study.

The Racial Isolation study was concerned with the causes, extent, effects, and remedy of school segregation. We shall examine only the material dealing with effects.

The Commission employed five research approaches. First, and most important, was a re-analysis of basic data gathered by the Office of Education study. It should be noted that the re-analysis was of the data on tapes and not of the findings by the Office. In a real sense, this part of the Racial Isolation project is a new study in its own right. Second, a longitudinal study was made of Richmond, California. Third, an analysis was made of 1965 high school graduates in Oakland, California; we reviewed this study in Chapter II. Fourth, a study was made of long-term effects of desegregated schooling upon adult attitudes; we shall examine this study in Chapter VII. Fifth, a series of special studies, concerning mostly specific locations, were commissioned. Reference to one of these, by Stout and Inger, was made in Chapter II. In addition, the Commission research staff undertook special assignments.

Let us examine the study in the order of topics utilized earlier in this Chapter.

A. Desegregation and Achievement.

1. Re-analysis of the Office of Education data.

James McPartland and Robert L. York performed this part of the study.[1]

A principal problem was to disentangle the effects of race and social class upon achievement. This relationship had been left somewhat indistinct in the Office of Education study. In reviewing achievement scores, McPartland and York determined that "there is a positive association of achievement scores with the racial composition of the classroom, no matter what the racial composition of the school may be."[2] Is this simply an effect of social class? The researchers found that even when "holding constant the social class of the student and his school, there remains an upward trend in average achievement level as the proportion of white classmates increases."[3]

Thus, an inconsistency appeared between this finding and that of the Office of Education study. In the latter, racial desegregation was accorded a minor role; in the Commission study, it is seen as major. McPartland and York suggest two reasons for the inconsistency: (1) the statistical technique used in the earlier study tended to confound class and race; and (2) the earlier study, in applying the regression analysis, used the school rather than the classroom as its object of analysis. Yet, stress McPartland and York, "it is in the classroom within the school where the characteristics of the fellow-students have their effects."[4] Negro students in a segregated classroom, for example, do not benefit even if the school as a whole is racially balanced. The Office of Education study was unable to make such a distinction.

2. The Richmond, California Study

This study was directed by Alan B. Wilson.[1] He concluded that "racial composition of the school, while tending to favor Negro students in racially integrated schools, does not have a substantial effect -- not nearly so strong as the social-class composition of the school."[2] In its turn, social class composition of the school had more effect on Negro than white students. While Wilson arrived at a similar finding on several different tests, he noted that "there are hardly any Negroes in our sample in predominantly white schools or predominantly upper [social] status schools."[3] As a result, a test could not be made across-the-board, so to speak; i.e., the Richmond Negro sample was too small to enable Wilson to test the relation of social class and race under all conditions of color and racial composition of schools. It should also be noted that Wilson used the school rather than the classroom as the unit of analysis.[4] Possibly, the McPartland-York revision of the Office of Education weighting of social class and race might find its parallel in the case of Wilson's analysis if classrooms rather than school were studied. Meanwhile, there is no obvious reason to predict that this would, in fact, be the case.

3. Racial Isolation Staff

The Commission staff held that "at each level of teacher quality and school social class, the performance of Negro students is substantially higher in majority-white than majority-Negro schools."[5] Wilson had not found this to be the case, perhaps because, as noted above, he did not have a large enough sample. The Commission staff, however, had access to a larger sample, i.e., the national sample being restudied by McPartland and York. This sample consisted of low-ability Negro students; Wilson had lacked such representation in his sample sufficient to test under varying school conditions. The Commission staff controlled social class of students and found: "... The achievement of disadvantaged Negro students in the lowest achieving schools increases in majority-white classrooms. The trend grows stronger as the average achievement level of the school rises."[1] (The logic of this conclusion can be better understood, perhaps, if the reader reviews the findings of McPartland's study in Chapter II.)

B. Aspiration or Self-Concept.

1. The Armor Study

David Armor conducted a special study of the educational aspirations of Negro students.[2] He found that lower-class boys of high ability aspired higher in integrated than in segregated schools. (Contrarily, lower-class whites who are in predominantly Negro schools aspire a bit higher in such schools than in integrated schools.) "For the Negro male," concludes Armor, "it is the qualified, bright student from a lower class background and in a more deprived school, who is aided most by integration. ..."[3] This is getting the help where it is most needed. Negro lower-class girls in lower-class schools, on the other hand, aspire higher in segregated schools. Armor does not suggest an explanation for this contrariety.

In an earlier study, Fichter had reported that the typical Negro woman student in segregated Negro colleges "has the highest aspirations as a freshman but plummets the farthest in lower aspirations as a senior."[1] Fichter's explanation concerned the deepening realization of Negro women as to the probable heavy support they will have to supply and the consequent adjustment to this to the detriment of their educational aspirations.

2. The Richmond Study

Wilson found that "far more Negro students than whites of similar achievement levels, want to go to college."[2] This is especially true of lowest-achieving, lower-class Negro students. He also found that Negro students "report slightly higher perception of their academic ability than whites."[3] On the other hand, they tended to believe that they were incapable of getting better grades and that they could not control their fate. Their perception of a hostile environment accounted for both attitudes; as Wilson puts it, they tended to discount low grades as resulting from teacher prejudice and felt that the odds against them were too high for their own actions to change much.

3. Racial Isolation Staff

The Racial Isolation report stated:[4]

> Children from poorer backgrounds are less likely than children from well-to-do backgrounds to have concrete and definite plans for college. They also are less likely to have followed through on their aspirations by contacting a college official or reading a college catalogue.

In majority-Negro schools, those students who have the most educated teachers also have the highest educational aspirations. On the other hand, Negro students in majority white schools "are more likely to have definite college plans than similar situated students in majority-Negro schools, regardless of the quality of their teachers."[1]

In racially isolated schools, according to the Commission, low self-esteem is the rule.[2] Negro students in these schools "often doubt their own worth, and their teachers frequently corroborate these doubts."[3] These observations seem to be based on previous research and case studies rather than on an analysis of survey data. Previous research, however, tends to establish rather that high self-esteem is frequently found among students in segregated schools (Blake, Meketon, and others). A real question involves the interpretation of these high self-esteem scores.

C. Students in School.

1. Racial Isolation Staff

Students of both races who attend desegregated schools do not automatically modify their attitudes toward one another. As the Commission states:[4]

> . . . School desegregation has its greatest impact upon student attitudes and preferences through the mediating influence of friendship with students of the other race. Negro and white students who attend school with each other, but have no friends of the other race, are less likely to prefer desegregated situations than students in desegregated schools who have such friends. Having attended schools with students of the other race and having friends of the other race contribute to preferences for desegregation. The effect is strongest for students who have had both experiences.

Having attended desegregated schools remains an influence in a person's life long after he has left school.

A separate study was made of the relationship of interracial tensions in the school to Negro achievement and attitudes. The findings showed that Negro achievement was highest where tensions were least. McPartland and York observe: "Negro student achievement and attitudes in desegregated classes are related to the degree of interracial tension within the school."[1] They neglect, however, to observe that more or less the same is true in segregated classes.[2] McPartland and York also found that interracial tension varied with the number of children who had previously experienced desegregated schooling. Interracial friendships were more frequent among Negro students active in extra-curricular events.

The researchers conclude:[3]

> ... There is indeed an effect of desegregated schooling which results from the racial composition of the classroom, apart from the changes in social class level of the fellow students which often accompanies desegregation. The differences seem to be well explained by the racial associations of the student, which are much more a function of the racial composition of the classroom than either the student's social class or the social class level of the school.

This finding is fully in accord with much earlier research.

2. Richmond, California, Study

Wilson studied the relation of social class factors to the development of delinquency among his Richmond sample. He found that "53 percent of the Negro adolescent boys and 26 percent of the white adolescent boys have official police records of offenses during the 2 years prior to the administration of the questionnaire."[4] While Negroes are more likely to come from broken homes, in the Richmond study, broken homes were found to be unrelated to delinquency. In the matter of educational attainment, however, the relationship is strong: " ... Negroes are much less likely than whites to do well in school, and those who do poorly in school are much more likely to have police records, whether white or Negro. ..."[1] Why is this so?

Wilson contends that lack of school success weakens the stakes youths have in the school, family, and other institutions. They cease being sources of affection, involvement, and commitment for the future. Wilson summarizes: "The student who does poorly in school is less likely to like school, less likely to be involved in school activities, less likely to accept the school's authority, and less likely to see school as relevant to his future."[2] Socially segregated schools make matters worse, for "there is a substantial and significant difference in rates of official delinquency between the boys who attended predominantly middle-class junior high schools and those who went to lower-class schools. ... "[3] Wilson speculates that the segregation effect is an expression of the greater police surveillance that obtains in lower-class areas of the inner city. Because Negroes are disproportionately lower class, the segregation effect has a greater impact on them.

D. Non-Negro Minorities.

In requesting a study of racial isolation to be made by the Commission, President Johnson specified the subject matter as Negro and white children.

Accordingly, the study did not concern itself with Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, Indian-American, or Oriental-American children.

E. The Role of Compensatory Education.

In Wilson's study of Richmond, he concluded:[1]

> The large initial differences in social inheritance of children entering school are not perceptibly ameliorated by standard school programs of remedial reading, special classes for the "mentally retarded," which take place in segregated schools, and grouped classes within schools. Investments into compensatory programs should be designed to make cumulative increments to knowledge about the development of competence.

Thus, socially isolated schools failed to remedy the learning deficit of lower-class children, Negro and white.

The Commission sought to discover whether this finding applied (a) to racial isolation as well, and (b) to a sample of large cities. It proceeded to compare the achievement of Negro students in majority-Negro schools with and without compensatory education programs; it also compared achievement by the former students with that by Negro students in majority-white schools without compensatory programs. The first comparisons aimed to measure the specific achievement effect of compensatory programs; the second aimed to measure which achievement-effect was greater -- that of compensatory education or that of desegregation? All compensatory programs were evaluated by their own criteria of success in achieving growth in a cognitive skill. Only those programs were studied which had run their course and had been formally evaluated. One final note: Wilson stated that ordinary school remedial measures had not succeeded; he did not go on to guess what extraordinary measures might accomplish, even in a segregated context.

Compensatory programs in majority-Negro schools were found not to have accomplished their goals. No statistically significant -- and in some cases, even measurable -- difference could be found between the achievement of compensated and non-compensated children in almost all the projects. As for comparative progress under isolated-compensation and desegregation, the Commission found that in Syracuse, Seattle, Berkeley, and Philadelphia, the desegregated Negro children in majority-white schools had made greater achievement gains than the children in compensatory programs in majority-Negro schools.

Essentially, the Commission reached two conclusions on compensatory education: (1) as it is presently organized, it has failed; and (2) there are two reasons why it has failed: (a) it is conducted in a racially isolated framework, and (b) it is inadequately financed, thus preventing significant improvements in learning conditions. Whether or not compensatory programs can ever succeed is, therefore, in indeterminate measure, a practical matter. According to the Commission,[1]

> ... Efforts to improve a child's self-esteem cannot be wholly productive in a student environment which seems to deny his worth. ... The compensatory programs reviewed here appear to suffer from the defect inherent in attempting to solve problems stemming in part from racial and social class isolation in schools which themselves are isolated by race and social class.

It was thought improbable that compensatory programs in a socially and racially isolated framework could ever succeed in the absence of enormous expenditures.[2]

III. Appraisal of the Two Federal Reports

Katz has stated:[3]

> The dominant fact that emerges from the recent research endeavors of the U.S. Office of Education and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, is that educational opportunity is greater in racially balanced than in racially isolated schools. These historic studies show beyond any reasonable doubt that the academic attainments of both white and Negro pupils are significantly higher in majority-white classrooms than in majority-Negro classrooms.

As we saw in Chapter IV, Katz has also emphasized that whether racially-balanced classrooms will exert a favorable influence on the performance of minority-group students depends upon the school's ability to create "an atmosphere of genuine respect and acceptance."[1]

The Racial Isolation study can all too easily be misinterpreted in accordance with a kind of statistical determinism. That is, desegregation and integration can be represented as depending upon a mere statistical distribution of Negro and white children. Katz has counteracted this tendency by plumbing the psychological dynamics of desegregation. Pettigrew has worked in the same direction.

Systematic critiques of the Racial Isolation study are still non-existent. The Bowles-Levin critique of the Office of Education study also charged that because the Commission study failed to control adequately the factor of social class, it could not demonstrate the autonomous contribution of race. Pettigrew has replied to this criticism.[2]

The studies of the Office of Education and Commission on Civil Rights mark the conclusion of a long first stage in the history of research on desegregation. A field has been staked out; it has now gone through two reconnaissances.

By far most of the subjects treated in both studies had already been dealt with earlier. Many of the same specific conclusions had already been reached in earlier research. Both in scale and scope, however, the two federal studies are new factors. Also, the scientific resourcefulness of the Racial Isolation study is especially outstanding.

FOOTNOTES

Page 185

1. James S. Coleman and others, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

2. James S. Coleman, Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

3. U. S. Office of Education, Supplemental Appendix to the Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

Page 186

1. Equality of Educational Opportunity, pp. 307 and 331.

Page 187

1. Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 280.
2. Ibid., p. 281.
3. Ibid., p. 289.
4. Ibid., pp. 323-324.
5. See Chapter III, p. 89.

Page 188

1. Ibid., pp. 488-489.
2. *Ibid., p. 317; see, also, p. 297.*
3. See Chapter III, p. 71.

Page 189

1. Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 296.
2. Ibid., p. 299.
3. Ibid., p. 302.

Page 190

1. George Mayeske, Educational Achievement Among Mexican-Americans: A Special Report From the Educational Opportunities Survey. Analytical Note No. 50. Washington, D.C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Office of Education, January 9, 1967.

2. Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 296.

3. Ibid., p. 302.

Page 191

1. Ibid., p. 29.

2. See Irene Albert and Pamela Sheldon, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," Educational Leadership, December, 1966; Joseph Alsop, "Reaction to the Coleman Report," N.E.A. Journal, September, 1967, David Blumenthal, "Coleman Report Brings Revolution, No Solution," Harvard Crimson, November 28, 1967; Samuel Bowles and Henry M. Levin, Equality of Educational Opportunity -- A Critical Appraisal, 1967; James S. Coleman, The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity, paper read at a conference at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967; Coleman, "Toward Open Schools," Public Interest, Fall, 1967; Coleman, "Equal Schools or Equal Students?" Public Interest Summer, 1966, Robert A. Dentler, "Equality of Educational Opportunity -- A Special Review," Urban Review, December, 1966; Henry S. Dyer, Social Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity, paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967; Edmund W. Gordon, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," IRCD Bulletin, November, 1967; Meg Greenfield, "What Is Racial Balance in the Schools?" Reporter, March 23, 1967; Christopher Jencks, "Education: The Racial Gap," New Republic, October 1, 1966, Irwin Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18 1967; Katz, (Reply to review by Nichols in December 9, 1966 issue of Science), Science, May 13, 1967; George W. Mayeske, Frederic D. Weinfeld, and Albert E. Beaton, Jr., Item Response Analyses of the Educational Opportunities Survey Teacher Questionnaire, Analytical Note No. 59 (Washington, D.C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, May 18, 1967; Floyd McKissick, "Is Integration Necessary?" New Republic, December 3, 1966; Deborah Meier, "The Coleman Report," Integrated Education, December 1967; Alexander M. Mood, Murray Spitzer, David S. Stoller, and Frederic D. Weinfeld, "Are Better Schools Better?" Science, May 12, 1967, Robert C. Nichols, "Schools and the Disadvantaged," Science, December 9, 1966;

Nichols, (Rejoinder to letters by Katz, Mood, and others) Science, May 12, 1967; Thomas F. Pettigrew, The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967; Pettigrew, Race and Equal Educational Opportunity, unpublished paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967; William H. Sewell, Leonard A. Marascuilo, and Harold W. Pfautz, Review Symposium on the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, American Sociological Review, June, 1967; U. S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Federal Role in Urban Affairs, Hearings, Parts 2 and 6 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), testimony of John W. Gardner and Harold Howe II in Part 2; see, also, letters to Senator Abraham Ribicoff from Ernest Q. Campbell, James S. Coleman, and Harold Howe II, Part 2, pp. 343, 344, 348-349, and letter from Campbell to Senator Albert Gore in Part 6; U. S. Office of Education, Supplemental Appendix to the Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

Page 194

1. Quoted in Integrated Education, December, 1965 - January, 1966, p. 4.

2. Equality of Educational Opportunity, pp. 137 and 164.

Page 195

1. Bowles and Levin, p. 26 (emphasis in original).

2. See Jesse Burkhead with Thomas G. Fox and John W. Holland, Input and Output in Large-City High Schools (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967) and Sexton, Education and Income (N. Y.: Viking, 1961).

3. Burkhead, p. 59.

Page 196

1. Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 164.

Page 197

1. Jacob Landers, Testimony at Public Hearing on "Education in New York City for Low Income Youngsters", November 16, 1967, pp. 21-22.

2. Patricia Cayo Sexton, "Comments on Three Cities," Integrated Education, August, 1963, p. 31.

Page 198

1. See *Hobson* v. *Hansen*, *Congressional Record*, June 21, 1967, pp. H7655 - H7697.

Page 200

1. See Appendix C1, "Further Analysis of Equality of Educational Opportunity," in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 35-142.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 40.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

Page 201

1. See Appendix C3, "Educational Consequences of Segregation in a California Community," in *ibid.*, II, pp. 165-206.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 184.

4. This criticism as well as others are made in Thomas F. Pettigrew, *The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967, pp. 9-11.

5. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, I, pp. 98-99.

Page 202

1. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

2. See Appendix C2, "The Racial Composition of Schools and College Aspiration of Negro Students," *ibid.*, II, pp. 143-164.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 146.

Page 203

1. Joseph H. Fichter, *Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Experiences and Expectations of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1965), p. 6.

2. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, II, p. 193.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 192.

4. *Ibid.*, I, p. 81.

Page 204

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100 (emphasis added).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 106.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 111.

Page 205

1. *Ibid.*, II, p. 42.

2. See Table 6.1, *ibid.*, p. 93.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

4. *Ibid.*, II, p. 199.

Page 206

1. *Ibid.*

2. *Ibid.*, p. 201.

3. *Ibid.* For a closely related theory, see Walter E. Schafer and Kenneth Polk, "Delinquency and the Schools," Appendix M in the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

Page 207

1. *Ibid.*, II, p. 203.

Page 208

1. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 138-139.

2. See David K. Cohen, "Policy for the Public Schools," *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter, 1968. See, also, Edmund W. Gordon and Adelaide Jablonsky, *Compensatory Education in the Equalization of Educational Opportunity*, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967; and *Ghetto Schools* (Washington, D.C.: New Republic Magazine, 1967).

3. Irwin Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967, p. 1.

Page 209

1. Ibid., p. 26.

2. Pettigrew, The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look, footnote 10, pp. 26-27.

CHAPTER VII

THE NEGRO COMMUNITY AND DESEGREGATION

The contemporary Negro movement for human rights is historic in that it consists of and is led by Negroes. And yet, little is known about the Negro community background of the movement for equal educational opportunity. A large number of community studies have been made but these turn out to deal with white community attitudes toward Negroes. It is exceedingly difficult to grasp the present historic challenge in American education without gaining a perspective on changes within the Negro community.

In the body of the present Chapter, six topics are discussed: (1) the attitudes of Negro adults who attended desegregated schools; (2) studies of attitudes toward desegregation in various local Negro communities; (3) results of national public opinion polls that relate to Negro attitudes on desegregation; (4) local desegregation movements taking the form of demonstrative actions by organized Negroes; (5) certain aspects of Negro parent participation in school affairs; and (6) some structural features of the Negro ghetto community.

I. Desegregated Adults and Desegregated Schools

A. The NORC Study

During the summer of 1966, the National Opinion Research Center conducted a survey for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.[1] Interviewed were 1,624 Negro men and women who lived in the North and West. The primary problem of the survey was to measure the long-run effects of school integration on adult Negroes; the respondents were between the ages of 21 and 45. The summary findings of the survey are as follows:[2]

> ... The impact of integration is widespread. Negro graduates of integrated schools are less likely to have attended and graduated college. ... The present study found that [Negro students in integrated schools not only score higher on achievement tests while in school but that] they continue to score higher as adults. They are more likely to have better jobs and higher incomes. In general, they have more contact with whites as adults, less anti-white feeling, and in general, stronger feelings of optimism about the opportunities available to them and a greater sense of happiness. ...

The survey found, too, that Negro adults who had attended integrated elementary schools were, contrary to common expectation, not from higher socioeconomic circumstances than adults who had attended segregated schools. (Education and marital stability of parents was the measure of socioeconomic status of family.)

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "Good luck is just as important as hard work for success." Table 8 illustrates the finding:[3]

Table 8.

Percent Agreeing With Statement, By Integration of Elementary and High School, Northern-Born Students

	Elementary School	
High School	Integrated	Segregated
Integrated	50	26
Segregated	39	37

NORC reported indirect evidence that Negroes who had attended integrated schools made more informal contacts with whites which led more frequently to a job.[1]

In general, Negroes who attended integrated schools as children are less antagonistic toward whites even if the Negroes now live in segregated housing. NORC comments: "Past contact with whites is a substitute for present contact in breaking down Negro desires to avoid whites. This implies that even if segregation in other aspects of American society is unchanged, an increase in school integration will in itself increase the willingness of Negroes to associate with whites."[2] On the other hand, less social distance does not mean greater illusions. Nearly nine tenths of the once-desegregated Negroes agreed that "the trouble with white people is that they think they are better than other people."[3]

Having attended an integrated school has a profound influence on the Negro adult. In ascertaining respondents' feeling of happiness:[4]

> ... We find that having a high education, having attended an integrated school, or having a high number of contacts with whites each increases happiness, and surprisingly, school integration is the most important of the three factors.

NORC suggest that school integration enhances the self-conception of the Negro and thus contributes to his happiness.[5]

NORC also interviewed a national sample of adult whites during the summer of 1966. In a few cases, it was possible to trace the effect upon these white adults of having attended integrated schools. Such adults had uniformly more favorable attitudes toward integration of the school in their present neighborhood, and expressed less anti-Negro prejudice.

Table 9.

Percent Highly Prejudiced, Among White Persons Who Did and Did Not Attend School With Negroes, By Educational Status of Respondent and Spouse[1]

Educational Status of Respondent and Spouse	Percent Highly Prejudiced Attended School With Negroes	 Attended All-White Schools
Very high	11	12
High	12	22
Medium	27	35
Low	15	25

Table 9 shows that even of the most highly prejudiced whites, those who had attended integrated schools were less likely to be prejudiced.

The NORC survey data on whites were analyzed in greater detail under supervision of Pettigrew.[2] In general, but more so for males than for females, adult whites who had attended desegregated schools reported that at least at one time they had had a close Negro friend, had had a Negro friend visit their home, and were living in a neighborhood that housed some Negroes now. White adults who had experienced interracial schooling tended to favor interracial neighborhoods. The effect of having had a Negro friend at one time is a powerful factor in determining a favorable attitude toward interracial neighborhoods. Among white respondents who had attended segregated schools, those who had had a Negro friend at one time were now more favorable to integrated neighborhoods than those who had never had a Negro friend.

Pettigrew drew three major conclusions from this analysis:[1]

> Prior desegregated schooling enhances the probability that white Americans will have had and will continue to have contact with Negro Americans. ...
>
> To a lesser extent, prior desegregated schooling enhances the probability that white Americans will express more positive attitudes toward interracial contact and Negro rights. ...
>
> Childhood contact leads to later contact and to more favorable attitudes toward contact; it leads somewhat less to rejection of racially discriminatory practices, and little if any to more positive acceptance of Negro protest.

He noted several reservations of a procedural nature about the data gathered. These related to the inability to control for several variables. In the main, however, Pettigrew held that these difficulties did not vitiate the above conclusions.

B. The Oakland Study.

In the Oakland, California study, discussed in Chapter II, above, data were collected on the consequences of attendance in interracial schools. Three findings were noted:[2]

> 1. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are more willing for their off-springs to have an interracial education than those who attended segregated schools.
>
> 2. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are more willing to live in biracial neighborhoods (irrespective of difficulty encountered) and are more likely to have white friends, than Negroes who attended segregated schools.
>
> 3. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are on the average less suspicious of whites, and feel somewhat more at ease in a biracial setting, than similar Negroes who attended segregated schools.

These findings were highly consistent with those of the NORC study.

II. Negro Community Attitudes

Blumenfeld studied the Negro social elite in Baltimore.[1] Until 1901, most elementary school teachers and all high school teachers were white. By 1910 or so, Negro teachers had replaced white teachers in the legally segregated Negro elementary schools. Nearly all the former were graduates of a one-year course in the High and Training School in Baltimore. This teacher group developed into a segregated Negro elite. By the early 1960's, the group was no longer united on the principle of ethnic separation. As Blumenfeld notes:[2]

> In 1962, while some of the Elite families were sending their children to schools which were an hour's drive away in order that the children might attend an integrated school, a sizable number of Elite families would have their children travel a comparable distance in order to avoid having the child sit in an integrated classroom.

No support is found in Blumenfeld's study for the often-heard generalization that desegregation has a distinctive appeal to the Negro middle class.

Rivera, McWorter, and Lillienstein studied, among other things, social class factors in two large-scale school boycotts in Chicago.[3] In tracing those Negro parents who had supported the first boycott in October, 1963, but "defected" from the second in February, 1964, Rivera and associates explained:[4]

> Those who shifted from a pro to an anti-boycott stand ... were disproportionately persons of higher educational attainment. These figures imply a challenge to at least one widely held assumption concerning the values of middle-class Negroes: that such persons attach overriding importance to the principle of desegregated public school facilities. ... [Defectors] tend to stress the quality of their children's education over the number of whites who happen to be enrolled in neighborhood schools.

The October boycott had drawn 224,000 Negro students while the February boycott drew 172,000.[1] The largest differences in participation were found in middle-class Negro areas.

In May, 1963, and again late in 1964, De Berry and Agger conducted public opinion studies of the small Negro community in Portland, Oregon.[2] About nine of every ten Negro respondents approved of integrated neighborhoods and schools. Almost three quarters of the group approved of busing children for purposes of racial balance. These views did not change during the year and a half intervening between both studies.

During October, 1964, Marx surveyed a national sample of Negro-Americans.[3] He found that "the black nationalist sympathizers in our sample are at least as high and even higher than other in their concern over integration and in their opposition to discrimination."[4] In response to the question, "Do you think white children and Negro children should go to the same schools or to separate schools?" the following percentages of the national sample selected the "same schools" answer.[5]

96%	New York
93%	Chicago
84%	Atlanta
79%	Birmingham

The more militant the viewpoint on Negro rights, the stronger the support for school desegregation.[6]

During Spring and Summer, 1965, Smith and associates polled a Negro sample in Metropolitan Detroit.[7] When asked "Would you say the racial integration of schools is moving [at a certain pace]?" responses were grouped as in the table which follows.

Table 10.

Negro Views on Pace of School Desegregation in Detroit Area[1]

	Non-Members of any formal association	Holders of a single membership	Holders of plural memberships
Too rapidly	9%	6%	2%
About right	37	41	33
Too slowly	45	44	65
Don't know	9	9	0

In the NORC survey, it was found that whether or not the Negro respondent had attended a desegregated school strongly influenced his response to the following question: "Is it a hardship on a Negro child to go to an integrated school if he is one of a small number of Negroes in the school?" Here is a compilation of the responses:[2]

	Northern-born; school was		Southern-born; school was		Southern educated
	Integr.	Segreg.	Integr.	Segreg.	
Percent saying yes, it is a hardship	33	43	30	48	50

In the Dumbarton study of Oakland, California Negro high school graduates in the sample felt that "the Negro child would be better off in a school with white children (94%) , and the majority (64%) regard integration no hardship on the Negro child even if he is but one of a few in the school."[3] Eighty-one percent of the graduates who had attended desegregated schools were willing for their own child to be sent out of the neighborhood; only fifty-five percent of those who had attended segregated schools were willing.[4]

Pettigrew reported that desegregation tended to become self-perpetuating. Once having attended a desegregated school, both Negroes and whites were all the more willing to send their own children to such schools; and they were more willing to advocate desegregation as a principle. It is important to note that this finding held even with respondents who presently lived in segregated housing.

Krystall, Chesler, and White made a study in February, June, and November of 1966 of the Negro community in Montgomery, Alabama.[1] One-hundred twenty-seven parents were interviewed; they had 252 children in school. Only four of these children (1.6 percent) were enrolled in desegregated public schools.[2] Only a third of the parents believed Negro schools were at least as good as white schools; over half (55 percent) believed Negro schools were inferior. Yet, nearly all the parents (96 percent) expressed satisfaction with their childrens' schooling. The researchers had no ready explanation for this seeming contradiction.

In March, 1966, a federal court directed the Montgomery school board to install a free-choice enrollment system. Very few Negro parents applied. While many indicated at one time or another their intention to register their children, it was found that 80% really have not considered seriously the possibility of sending their children to an all-white school."[3] At the same time, nearly as many (71 percent) approved of the principle of desegregated schools. Table 11 reveals some of the reasoning behind the hesitancy of Negro parents.[4]

Table 11.
Advantages and Disadvantages of Going to a White School, According to Negro Parents in Montgomery, Alabama

	Advantages		Disadvantages
Children learn more	23%	Adjust to new school	15%
Wider subject choice	6	No white friends	18
Better facilities and equipment	28	Harm from whites	22
More attention from teachers	5	Transportation	8
White schools better; equal education	8	Don't know	37
Don't know	30		

The increasing salience of black nationalist ideology may also help explain the hesitancy to desegregate, although the researchers do not offer this explanation. Late in 1964, Marx polled a national sample of Negroes with this question: "If the United States got into a war today, would you personally feel this country was worth fighting for, or not?" Ninety-one percent of Marx's Birmingham sample said yes.[1] Almost two years later, in the study by Krystall and associates, Montgomery adult Negroes were asked to agree or disagree with this statement: "Negroes who are denied first class citizenship here in the U. S. should not go and fight for the U.S. in some foreign country." Grouping the replies of registered voters[2] by whether they registered before or after passage of the 1965 federal Voting Right Act, here is how they responded:[3]

	Registered Before 1965	Registered After 1965
Agree	48%	52%
Disagree	62	38

Assuming a degree of likeness between the Negro people in Birmingham and Montgomery, the later study shows a sharp rise in black nationalist sentiment.

During the first half of 1967, Passow directed a comprehensive survey of the District of Columbia public school system.[1] Over 90 percent of the system's enrollment consists of Negro children. Nevertheless, fifty-eight percent of Negro parents favored attempts to desegregate the schools and only twenty-six percent favored upgrading the segregated schools; corresponding percentages for white parents were 26 and 48.[2] Here is a summary of survey results on three questions asked of Negro and white parents:[3]

Table 12.
The Use of Busing and Creation of Metropolitan School District to Enhance District Integration (in Percentage)

	Total	Negro	White
Position on integration			
Integrate schools	49	58	26
Improve segregated schools	33	27	48
Not sure	18	15	26
Busing			
Favor	38	45	21
Oppose	50	41	69
Not sure	12	14	10
Metropolitan school district			
Favor	29	34	19
Oppose	54	49	67
Not sure	17	17	14

Community leaders, according to Passow, do not share the Negro parents' dedication to integration: "Most leaders interviewed seem to have abandoned their hope of integrating the public schools in Washington, D. C."[4]

Spiegel led a study of civic violence in six large cities: Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Dayton, Akron, San Francisco, and Boston.[5] He found a great impatience among Negroes at the slow progress of desegregation.

A study of civil rights in Chicago was made during the Summer of 1967.[6] Ninety-three percent of Negro respondents favored integrated schools. Negro and white respondents were asked: "How about you?

Are you less in favor of rapid integration or more strongly in favor of rapid integration than you were a year ago?" Responses were as follows:[1]

	Negro	White
Less in favor	9.4	50.1
About the same	32.6	34.9
More in favor	57.9	15.0

The researchers reported: "Our data suggest that ... it is not only adequate schools but integrated schools ... to which Negroes aspire. ... There is absolutely no indication in these data that a northern version of 'separate but equal' facilities and housing will be accepted by the growing Negro middle-class."[2]

The Chicago researchers constructed a civil rights index and a militance of action index; the former is a measure of opinion on a range of public issues; the latter, on orientation toward social action. Table 13 classifies the responses given to a question about schools in Chicago. Fewer than half the Negro respondents think the schools are good; the more dissatisfied they are with schools, the more devoted on civil rights issues and the more militant in tactics. A number of significant interrelations can be found among the responses within each racial group as well as between both groups.

Perhaps most significant is the fact that Summer, 1967, was -- for Chicago -- very mild civil rights weather. There were virtually no public demonstrations or marches and the public school system had receded temporarily from public view as an issue of contention. Civil rights organizations were experiencing large losses in support. Yet, Negro

Table 13.

CIVIL RIGHTS INDEX

How would you rate the public schools in this neighborhood?	Percent distribution	Full acceptance	Would oppose -- Open occupancy	School integration	Equal employment & facilities	Total number
White						
Good	65.4	35.9	41.5	12.8	9.8	686
Fair	10.4	42.9	30.4	11.6	15.2	112
Poor	3.8	39.0	31.7	14.6	14.6	41
Don't know	20.4	36.0	38.3	15.9	9.8	214
Negro						
Good	40.8	71.1	23.6	3.9	1.4	280
Fair	24.6	72.8	23.7	2.9	0.6	173
Poor	12.2	86.7	10.8	2.4	0.0	83
Don't know	22.4	63.9	29.7	3.2	3.2	155

MILITANCE-OF-ACTION INDEX

	Pro-Action			Anti-Action		
	Strong	Moderate	Neutral	Strong	Moderate	Total number
White						
Good	1.1	25.7	7.6	36.6	29.0	708
Fair	5.3	22.1	8.0	37.2	27.4	113
Poor	2.4	34.1	4.9	36.6	22.0	41
Don't know	2.3	20.8	10.4	40.7	25.8	221
Negro						
Good	20.2	76.0	2.8	1.0	0.0	287
Fair	31.2	63.6	1.2	3.5	0.6	173
Poor	39.5	57.0	2.3	1.2	0.0	86
Don't know	19.6	74.1	2.5	3.8	0.0	158

dedication to school integration grew. Hardly less significant was the further fact that Negro devotion to integration did not suffer in the face of black nationalist endeavors.

III. National Public Opinion Polls

Brink and Harris reported on two comprehensive national studies of the Negro American, sponsored by Newsweek magazine.[1]

Seven out of ten Negroes favored integrated schools (in both years); another two were undecided. When asked whether the Negro child attending school with whites would do better or worse work, replies were as follows:[2]

	Total non-South	Total South
Better work	70%	62%
Worse work	1	4
About same	20	18
Not sure	9	16

About half favored busing their children to another part of town for integration.[3] In 1966, respondents were asked: "As far as your 'being able to get your children educated with white children', do you feel you are better off today than you were three years ago, worse off, or about the same as your were then?" Replies were as follows:[4]

	Total all interviews		Total non - South	
	1966	1963	1966	1963
Better off	58%	39%	47%	28%
Worse off	3	5	3	6
About the same	23	35	34	45
Not sure	16	21	16	21

Between 1963 and 1966, therefore, Negro parents maintained their interest in school desegregation; they felt real progress had occurred, with southern Negroes reporting even more progress; and there was a pragmatic reason for supporting desegregation -- parents thought their children would learn more while attending a desegregated school.

From 1963 through 1967, numerous national public opinion polls were taken; specific questions on desegregation were often included. Following is a sampling.

In 1965, a Harris poll reported that Negro parents were less favorable to busing than two years earlier.[1] In 1966, the Gallup Poll found that whites were happier than Negroes; Negro parents expressing satisfaction with the education their children were receiving rose from 43 percent to 64 percent since 1963.[2] A Gallup Poll of August, 1967, asked: "In your opinion, how well do you think Negroes are treated in this community?" Responses were as follows:[3]

	Negroes	Whites
The same as whites	44%	76%
Not very well	44	15
Badly	9	1
No opinion	3	8

During October-November, 1967, a Fortune poll found that urban Negro Americans strongly supported desegregation.[4]

Over 300 Negroes in 13 cities responded to Negro interviewers as follows when asked to rank their own objectives:

More education for my children	97%
More desegregation	93
A better job	87
Some kind of special training	77
Better police protection	69
More education for myself	62
Making neighborhood a better place to live	60
More money to spend	53
Moving out of the neighborhood	20

When asked whether they accept integration as a goal for Negroes, they responded as follows:

	Total	16-25 Years	26 Years and over
No--Integration of any kind not desirable	5%	9	2
Yes--limited integration wanted, in terms of equal opportunity in jobs, education, and housing	77%	72	81
Yes--total integration wanted on all levels	12%	12	11

IV. Organized Local Desegregation Movements

The surest sign of community support for desegregation is a public demonstration on its behalf. Many more of these occur, North and South, than are recorded in the newspapers of national repute or national magazines; sometimes, they go unrecorded, even in the major local newspaper. For southern developments, two prime sources are the monthly

School Desegregation in the Southern and Border States[1] and the weekly Southern Courier (covering Alabama).[2] News of local community desegregation developments in northern and western communities is published regularly in the bi-monthly Integrated Education.[3] The general inattention to these community demonstrations has made it more difficult to gauge accurately the role of desegregation in Negro communities.

Following is an incomplete compilation of these events drawn from Integrated Education, 1965-1967:

Place	Form of Action
New York, New York	School boycott
Teaneck, New Jersey	School board elections
Trenton, Pennsylvania	Demonstration on behalf of Chester movement for integration
Evanston, Illinois	NAACP threat to help defeat bond issue
Houston, Texas	School boycott
Tipton County, Tennessee	Demonstration
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Picket line
Springfield, Massachusetts	Sit-in, school board office
Boston, Massachusetts	Sit-in at school
Philadelphia, Pa.	Picketing of school
Chicago, Illinois	School boycott
St. Paul, Minnesota	Picketing of school board
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Picketing of school board
Crawfordsville, Georgia	Demonstration
Washington, Georgia	Demonstration
Bogalusa, Louisiana	School boycott
Huntsville, Texas	Demonstration
Natchez, Mississippi	Boycott of stores
Lincolnton, Georgia	School boycott
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	School boycott
Riverside, California	School boycott
Bridgeport, Connecticut	Demonstration
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Picketing of construction site
Tuscaloosa, Alabama	School boycott
Atlantic City, New Jersey	Picketing of school board
Englewood, New Jersey	Unauthorized group registration at white school

Laverne, Alabama	School boycott
Natchez, Mississippi	City-Wide school boycott
Lorman, Mississippi	Demonstration by students
Cordele, Georgia	Demonstration by students
Jacksonville, Florida	Picketing of school board
Seattle, Washington	School boycott
Detroit, Michigan	School boycott
Englewood, New Jersey	Parent demonstrations
Phoenix-South Holland, Illinois	School boycott
Grenada, Mississippi	Demonstration
Woodville, Mississippi	Demonstration
Peoria, Illinois	Sit-in at school board office
Providence, Rhode Island	Demonstration
Fayette, Mississippi	Boycott of stores
Jacksonville, Florida	School boycott
Oakland, California	School boycott
Grenada, Mississippi	School boycott
Port Gibson, Mississippi	Boycott of stores
Menlo Park, California	Picketing of school
Maywood, Illinois	Demonstration
District of Columbia	Boycott of schools
Toledo, Ohio	Boycott of school
Lexington, Kentucky	Demonstration
Wadesboro, North Carolina	Boycott of school

Undoubtedly, many other cases went unrecorded. Also, numerous non-demonstrative public actions on behalf of desegregation were taken. Among these were public meetings, lawsuits filed, gatherings to support Negro children already enrolled in desegregated schools, public appeals to the Negro community to use the opportunity to enroll in such schools, sermons preached and countless other actions, including electoral work. Many of the demonstrative actions have been followed by a long train of negotiations which also keep the issue alive in many Negro communities.

V. Parent Participation in School Affairs

Gordon has remarked:[1]

> The tradition in school administration of discouraging lay people, particularly poor or minority lay people, from participating in the determination of school policy will need to be sharply modified. These parents and community spokesmen may be a hidden resource which the depressed area schools have used inappropriately or not at all.

It might be said that a fairly widespread reconsideration of the Negro parents' role in the school is underway. Part of it arises from political exigencies; organized parent groups are demanding an increased voice. A smaller part is due to growing knowledge and awareness of the actual parental role. In the process of this new consciousness, a number of traditional preconceptions are being revised.

Some years ago a schoolman stated what was and still is a common understanding: "It is the better communities which get the better school facilities and they get them because they are more articulate."[1] Inferentially, then, the less "better" communities were inarticulate; often, they were also assumed to be apathetic about the schools. In certain respects, this view was realistic; in largest measure, however, it was an oversimplified conception. At any rate, one could be fairly sure that the preconceptions were seldom tested against the reality of the Negro community. It was not a congenial subject for Caucasian researchers, nor, apparently, for Negro middle-class researchers.

More recently, scholarly excursions into the ghetto have increased. Consequently, we are getting a more adequate basis for understanding the relation of the Negro community to the school.

More than a dozen years ago, Riessman found that the Negro worker in Philadelphia was not only more willing than the white worker to participate in school affairs: "... The proportion of Negro workers indicating a positive willingness to participate in community and school activity is approximately the same for the white middle-class group."[2] In the

Detroit Metropolitan area, when support is defined in terms of willingness to pay taxes "Negro blue collar workers are more supportive of education than are whites who are professional, technical, or kindred."[1] In Washington, D. C., Negro parents attend PTA meetings somewhat more frequently than white parents.[2] Among Negro parents in the extremely large-scale Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, a researcher reported that "a significant number of parents (84%) revealed a positive attitude toward education; however, only 43% expressed a positive attitude toward teachers."[3] In a Chicago ghetto school, 63 percent of whose students live in public housing, teachers rated nearly seventy percent of parents as cooperative.[4] Also indicative of a positive orientation toward schools, of course, is the great number of public demonstrative actions on behalf of desegregation, discussed earlier. De Berry and Agger reported that in Portland, Oregon "Negroes -- much more than whites -- would like to have more influence in school affairs than they feel they have currently."[5]

Nevertheless, a completely new day has not yet dawned. Wayson studied teaching conditions in Chicago Negro ghetto schools. Experienced teachers who remained in these schools regarded as one attractive feature of the job "insularity from parental and other community pressures."[6] Wayson adds: "The slum school is isolated from the community and from parents who would question teachers' actions."[7] Gross and associates apparently had no great difficulty finding lower socioeconomic status (SES) schools in which parents took little interest in their children's education. They were able to make, among others, this generalization:

For low SES schools, the greater the average parental interest in the academic performance of their children, the higher the academic productivity of the school.[8]

Hollister studied parent-school relations in eighteen Detroit elementary schools.[1] Four of the schools were low-income Negro schools; six were middle-class white schools; and eight were integrated schools. He found:[2]

> . . . Both low income Negro parents and middle-income white parents have greater interest in education, higher educational aspirations for their children, values and standards that are more congruent with those of the school, and greater knowledge of how to help their child get through school than low-income white parents [in the integrated schools]. . . .

Lower-income white parents were less likely than either middle-income or Negro parents to initiate contact with the school. Hollister noted the contradiction between this finding and "much of the current practice literature that assumes uniformly indifferent attitudes toward the school among low-income populations.[3]

VI. The Ghetto Community

Coleman speaks of "the low level of cohesion that characterizes Negro communities" being far lower than the generally low level of community cohesion in American cities.[4] At the same time, Coleman continues, there is lack of mutual trust, "a belief in my mind that if I aid you today, you will aid me when I am in need."[5] It is possible to gain a different impression from some research studies.

In his study of Roxbury, a Negro ghetto in Boston, Feagin held that social isolation did not characterize the residents.[1] "The overwhelming majority of these Negroes," according to Feagin, "feel that they have a duty to aid their neighbors."[2] He estimated that they were "probably as well integrated with their neighbors as whites in various socioeconomic areas of our urban complexes."[3] In his study of a public housing project in St. Louis, Moore observed: "The disadvantaged family is an oasis in the environment of urban indifference. ... The attitude of the disadvantaged family is one of helping each other."[4] Choldin studied the help which migrants to Chicago had received during their first year there; he included six ethnic groups.[5] Two thirds of all migrants met a waiting friend or relative; Negroes -- more precisely, non-whites -- met someone with more than average frequency.[6] "Non-whites," according to Choldin, "are more likely to receive help from the person who receives them."[7] He also found that white and non-white migrants were remarkably similar "in making social connections and adjusting to the neighborhoods. ..."[8]

A distinguishing mark of the ghetto is its concentration of people and social contacts within small compass. Smith and associates trace the growing residential segregation in the Detroit Metropolitan Area as well as the widening of what they call the "interaction gap," i.e., the range of Negro-white contacts.[9] By plotting an "interactional ellipse" around a center line of interaction, the researchers found that "the area of the mean ellipse for whites is 48 square miles."[1] In Roxbury, Feagin found of his sample that "approximately 95% of their friends and 97% of their relatives live within the Roxbury-Dorchester area."[2] When Roxbury people moved -- which was often -- the mean distance was only 1.01 miles from their "old" neighborhood.[3] At the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, Moore discovered that sixty-three percent of the 200 pre-schoolers he observed had never left the project, an area of 25 square blocks;[4] more poignantly, he reported: "Eighty-three percent of the pre-school children studied had never been to the city zoo."[5]

The quality of human contact in the ghetto is not defined by the geographical construction. Feagin warns that the ghetto does not mean "isolation, impersonality, or disorganization. Intimate ties are maintained even within the ethnic slum."[6] A high degree of friendship relationships characterized the 120 Roxbury wives who were interviewed by Feagin. Much visiting occurs with relatives and friends. This, however, is more than twice as frequent among middle-income respondents as low-income respondents.[7]

The ghetto is not only compressed; its people are, in Feagin's word, encapsulated. Moore reported that not a single family in the public housing project subscribed to a newspaper; in Roxbury many families were subscribers. In the 1963 Newsweek poll, only thirty-seven percent of low-income Negro families outside the South reported having a telephone; this was considerably lower than even non-urban southern Negroes.[1] Twenty-five percent of the former group of homes were without a television set; only fifteen percent of the latter lacked a set.

The Negro ghetto may be the only ethnic concentration in the United States in which the younger generation is not uniformly better schooled than its parents. In New York, during 1963-1964: "... For perhaps one Negro man in three, his education is no greater than that of his father. About ten percent have had less education than their fathers."[2] Even those youth who remain in the ghetto schools fare poorly. In Central Harlem, "at least 50 percent of those in elementary schools are sufficiently retarded in the basic academic skills to require intensive remedial work, and at least 80 percent of those in the junior high schools would require extra help if they are to function effectively in high school."[3]

The ghetto is a place of first and last resort; the interim is spent trying to escape from it. Feagin studied the reasons why persons in his sample had located somewhere in Roxbury. He found:[4]

> ... At least 72% were forced to enter the housing market by urban renewal, etc., whether or not they actually wanted to do so. ... Thus, selectivity -- in the sense of a person choosing a project solely in order to increase social interaction -- does not seem to be an important factor in the housing choices of most of these Negro families.

In the St. Louis public housing project, poverty ruled out any choice of housing or even of food: "The family is frequently without enough money to plan from one meal to the other."[5]

New migrants to a large city are highly dependent on the ethnic neighborhood. Negroes, according to Choldin, are especially so: "They are most likely to stay in the neighborhood, most likely to feel that it is sufficient for them, and least likely to visit the public places of the city."[1] White southern migrants, on the other hand, regard the white slum as a temporary stopping place; they are not committed to the community; and they are isolated from their non-southern neighbors.[2]

There is little attachment of the urban Negro to his neighborhood. About one third of a sample of Chicago Negroes thought that their neighborhood was declining. As for a comparison of Negro-white attitudes toward neighborhood, the study found:[3]

> Negroes dislike their neighborhoods much more than whites dislike theirs. Only 19 percent of the Negroes rated their neighborhood as a "very good" place ... whereas 62 percent of the white respondents made this report. ... Negroes who regard their neighborhood as "very good" are less militant than those who regard their neighborhood as "fairly bad" or "very bad."

Respondents were asked to base their opinions on the totality of elements entering into a neighborhood: schools, play facilities, police and fire protection, street cleaning and garbage removal, and public transportation.

Moore writes: "disadvantaged homes do have an educational tradition. ... Its preoccupation is with survival."[4] It would seem that the ghetto neighborhood is not regarded as essential to this tradition.

VII. Conclusions

Inside Negro communities strong support for school desegregation comes from adults who themselves attended desegregated schools. Such adults are friendlier toward whites, seem to have a stronger sense of controlling their environment, and are happier. Adult whites who attended desegregated schools similarly favor desegregation both as a principle and as applied to their own white neighborhood.

Negro pro-desegregation sentiment was strong in Chicago, Detroit, Portland, Montgomery, and Washington, D.C. National polls taken in 1963 and 1966 found that Negro support of desegregation had increased. Numerous demonstrative public actions on behalf of desegregation were taken by organized Negroes; every part of the country was witness to these events.

Negro parents show a growing dissatisfaction with their lack of effective voice in school affairs. A contrary impression finds less and less support in the research evidence.

The ghetto community, which suffers from poverty and cultural encapsulation, contains unexpectedly large elements of normal human relations. The special problems of the ghetto preclude attachment to neighborhood and other factors unconnected with the daily problems of survival.

FOOTNOTES

Page 217

1. Robert L. Crain and others, The Effects of De Facto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1966).

2. Ibid., p. 4.

3. Ibid., p. 45.

Page 218

1. Ibid., p. 64.

2. Ibid., p. 79.

3. Ibid., p. 82. In general, see Schwartz, Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes.

4. Ibid., pp. 89, 92.

5. See tables in Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II pp. 218 - 220.

Page 219

1. Ibid., p. 107.

2. See Appendix C5, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, pp. 221 - 241.

Page 220

1. Ibid., p. 224.

2. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, p. 208.

Page 221

1. Ruth Blumenfeld, Children of Integration, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1965. University Microfilms Number 66-251.

2. Ibid., p. 112.

3. Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," Integrated Education, August-September, 1964.

4. Ibid., pp. 37, 40.

Page 222

1. Integrated Education, April-May, 1964, p. 7.

2. Clyde De Berry and Robert E. Agger, "School and Race in Portland," Integrated Education, April - May, 1965.

3. Gary T. Marx, Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1967).

4. Ibid., p. 110.

5. Ibid., p. 21.

6. Ibid., p. 46.

7. Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashshur, and Gary W. Shannon, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967).

Page 223

1. Ibid., p. 39.

2. Robert L. Crain and others, The Effects of De Facto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1966), p. 76.

3. Dumbarton Research Council, Race and Education in the City of Oakland, draft, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Menlo Park, California: Dumbarton Research Council, October, 1966), p. 135.

4. Ibid., p. 140.

Page 224

1. Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes (Tuskegee, Alabama: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March, 1967).

2. Ibid., pp. 27-28.

3. Ibid., p. 34.

4. Ibid., p. 35.

Page 225

1. Marx, Protest and Prejudice, p. 30.

2. Eighty-one percent of the sample was registered.

3. Krystall, Chesler, and White, p. 9.

Page 226

1. A. Harry Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools (N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967).

2. Ibid., p. 77.

3. Ibid., p. 71.

4. Ibid., p. 77.

5. John P. Spiegel in U. S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Antiriot Bill--1967 Hearings, Part 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967). See, also, Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Six-City Study. A Survey of Racial Attitudes in Six Northern Cities: Preliminary Findings (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, June, 1967).

6. The Interuniversity Social Research Committee -- Chicago Metropolitan Area, Militancy for and against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer, 1967 (Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967).

Page 227

1. Ibid., p. 49.

2. Ibid., p. 71.

Page 229

1. William Brink and Louis Harris, The Negro Revolution in America (N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1964) and Black and White (N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1967).

2. Brink and Harris, Negro Revolution in America, p. 237.

3. Ibid., p. 236.

4. Brink and Harris, Black and White, p. 228.

Page 230

1. Integrated Education, April - May, 1965, p. 4.

2. Ibid., February - March, 1967, p. 4.

3. Ibid., October - November, 1967, p. 4.

4. Roger Beardwood, "The New Negro Mood," Fortune, January, 1968.

Page 232

1. Published by the Southern Education Reporting Service, P. O. Box 6156, Nashville, Tennessee 37212.

2. Published at Room 1012, Frank Leu Building, Montgomery, Alabama 36104.

3. Published by Integrated Education Associates, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Page 233

1. Edmund W. Gordon, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," IRCD Bulletin, November, 1967, p. 3.

Page 234

1. Thaddeus J. Lubera, Assistant Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, March 7, 1951, quoted in Helen E. Amerman, The Impact of Inter-Group Relations on Non-Segregated Urban Public Education, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1954, p. 139.

2. Frank Riessman, Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, Columbia University, 1955, p. 137 (emphasis in original). University Microfilms Number 13,999.

Page 235

1. Smith and others, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area, p. 59.

2. Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System, p. 69.

3. William Moore, Jr., A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-School Child, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, St. Louis University, 1964, pp. 178-179. University Microfilms Number 64-13,475.

4. Raymond L. Jerrems, A Sociological-Educational Study of a Public School in a Negro Lower-Class Area of a Big City, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1965, p. 85.

5. De Berry and Agger, "School and Race in Portland," p. 14.

6. William W. Wayson, Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1966, pp. 170-171.

7. Ibid., p. 177.

8. Neal Gross, Walter O. Jewell, III, Ralph G. Lewis, and Eigil D. Pederson, "Some Sociological Correlates of the 'Academic Productivity' of Urban Elementary Schools with Pupils from Families of Low Socio-Economic Status," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, 1966, p. 18.

Page 236

1. Clifton D. Hollister, Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966. University Microfilms No. 67-8277.

2. Ibid., p. 60.

3. Ibid., p. 151.

4. James S. Coleman, Race Relations and Social Change (Baltimore, Md.: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967), p. 9.

5. Ibid., p. 22.

Page 237

1. Joe Richard Feagin, The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Harvard University, March, 1966, p. 23.

2. Ibid., p. 53.

3. Ibid., p. 60.

4. Moore, A Portrait, pp. 105-106.

5. Harvey M. Choldin, First Year in the Metropolis: A Study of Migration and Adjustment, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1965.

6. Ibid., pp. 50-51.

7. Ibid., p. 56.

8. Ibid., p. 79.

9. Smith and associates, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area, pp. 23 and 41.

Page 238

1. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

2. Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment*, p. 204.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 171.

4. Moore, *A Portrait*, p. 64.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

6. Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment*, p. 76.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

Page 239

1. Brink and Harris, *The Negro Revolution in America*, p. 197.

2. Jack Elinson, Paul W. Haberman, and Cyrille Gell, *Ethnic and Educational Data on Adults in New York City, 1963-1964* (N.Y.: School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, Columbia University, 1967) p. iv. In the nation as a whole, Negroes follow the general pattern of improving education by generation; see John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, *Education of the American Population* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 150-151.

3. Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., *Youth in the Ghetto. A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change* (N.Y.: HARYOU, 1964), pp. 411-412.

4. Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment*, p. 173.

5. Moore, *A Portrait*, p. 83.

Page 240

1. Choldin, *First Year in the Metropolis*, p. 83. See, also, Frank T. Cherry, *Southern In-Migrant Negroes in North Lawndale, Chicago 1949-59: A Study of Internal Migration and Adjustment*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1965.

2. Edwin S. Harwood, *Work and Community Among Urban Newcomers: A Study of the Social and Economic Adaptation of Southern Migrants in Chicago*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1966, pp. 57 and 175.

3. Interuniversity Social Research Committee--Chicago Metropolitan Area, *Militancy for and Against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago*, p. 22.

4. Moore, *A Portrait*, p. 174.

CHAPTER VIII

CRITICS OF DESEGREGATION

School desegregation has frequently been a subject of public debate and criticism. Much of this contention related to practical problems of how best to implement desegregation: timing, scope, and pace. Another line of criticism, however, rejects the very idea of desegregation. Such critics are, in varying degrees, proponents of racism. By racism is meant the belief that a person's race affects his essential capacity to function. The alleged disability is then used to justify differential treatment of the disabled person. Proponents of segregation on principle almost always defend their advocacy by a claim that the segregated group is intellectually or morally inferior by birth. American racists have claimed to demonstrate the racial inferiority of Negroes by citing differential I Q test scores consistently in favor of whites. In recent years racist attempts to demonstrate conclusively the intellectual inferiority of Negroes have taken on new life.[1]

Not all critics of desegregation, however, are racists. Opposition may also be incidental to a particular world view or political philosophy. Nevertheless, the consequence is the same in either case. In the remainder of this Chapter we will be interested in racist and non-racist criticisms of desegregation. The primary concern will be in examining the factual basis of the viewpoint rather than in the viewpoint itself.

I. The Shuey Book

In 1966 was published the second edition of The Testing of Negro Intelligence by Shuey.[1] It is a compendium of the findings of about 450 comparative studies and discussions of the intelligence of Negro and white persons, mostly children. "It is not the purpose of this book," according to the author, "to prove that Negroes are socially, morally, or intellectually inferior to whites; nor is its purpose to demonstrate that Negroes are the equal of or are superior to whites in these several characteristics."[2] At the conclusion of her review of findings, however, she held that these demonstrated "the presence of native differences between Negroes and whites as determined by intelligence tests."[3] Although she did not state the magnitude of these differences, in a review of tests of children's intelligence she reported a 14 point difference between white and Negro I Q scores in studies made over a forty-three year period.[4]

The book has virtually no relevance to a study of the effects of desegregation. Only a single study of the 450 deals specifically with this subject and Shuey reports correctly that the desegregated Negro children benefited significantly. This is Katzenmeyer's study, discussed earlier in Chapter II. Otherwise, Shuey fails to examine any of the mass of desegregation studies then available; her preface is dated March, 1966. A desegregation study is one that compares, say, the achievement of the same children before and after desegregation, with appropriate controls.

The absence of references to such studies in the book's section entitled "Controlling education and socioeconomic environment" is especially puzzling, for in a real sense this is what a good many desegregation studies aim at. None of the indexed references to "integrated schools" deal with desegregation; Katzenmeyer's study, which does, is not listed under "integrated schools." But even that study is belittled.

The reader will recall that Katzenmeyer found the Negro children in desegregated schools gained 6.54 I Q points and white children only 0.50 during the two-year test period; this he attributed to the beneficial effects of interracial interaction and the high level of schooling for all children in Jackson, Michigan. Shuey notes, however, that while white children in desegregated schools gained 0.60 I Q points, white children in all-white schools gained 3.21 points. She concludes from this that the greater gain by the latter "is traceable to the absence of social interaction between the two races."[1] While this is possible, a much greater probability is that the difference in white achievement reflects a social class difference. Unfortunately, Katzenmeyer did not record socioeconomic data. (His study was a census of all children in the respective grades and thus did not require matching data.)

There is also a logical difficulty in accepting a negative reason as an explanation of an event. The universe of negatives is infinite. Thus, in seeking to verify or contradict a negative, one must always be prepared to weigh one negative against another. So, if a differential gain is to be explained by the absence of social interaction, it is just as logical to attribute it to the absence of instruction or books or anxiety. There is no way of deciding what not to exclude as an explanation. On the other hand, the universe of positives is relatively limited. By asserting that an event is to be explained by the presence of a specific condition, we can test for its presence. Even after we verify its presence, that doesn't end matters for additional positives can be specified; or, a new perspective can change the relevance of old positives. Consequently, it is less satisfactory to attribute the 2.61 I Q point difference between white students to the absence of social interaction -- or the absence of anything -- than to attempt to account for it by socioeconomic differences. Nevertheless, the matter requires an empirical test which is not possible at this point. It would seem a simple task to perform the test.

Somewhat related problems arise in the course of Shuey's review of Tanser's study.[1] He studied intelligence differences among Negro and white children attending the same schools in Kent County, Ontario; six schools were rural, one was urban. Median I Q scores were grouped by color and place of residence, as follows:[2]

		Urban	Rural
Grades 1 and 2	White	98.41	92.0
	Negro	79.50	84.5
Grades 3 - 8	White	109.76	110.60
	Negro	94.81	96.67

One can make a number of things out of these findings. Note, as Shuey does not, that the urban Negro children's median is 15.31 points higher in later grades; the corresponding white differential is 11.35 points. Shuey does observe that in the 3 - 8 grade group, white scores are higher in each grade but that the difference diminishes after the fourth grade.[1] She attributes the later relative gain by Negroes to a "process of selection which takes place among the Negroes."[2] This process is not described. It must also be noted that we are speaking of the Negro children who attended the single urban school in Chatham. Shuey reports that "the socioeconomic status of the urban colored was without doubt inferior to that of the whites in the city of Chatham."[3] It seems warranted to conclude that Negro achievement in the urban school was extraordinary, given the distinctly unfavorable social circumstances of the Negro children. Despite social handicaps, the achievement gap between Negro and white grew smaller.

What of the Negro children in the six rural schools? As the listing above shows, the white median score is 18.50 points higher in the upper than in the lower grades; the corresponding figure for Negro children is 12.17 points. (Note that the Negro rural difference was larger than the white urban difference.) It is likely that at least part of the discrepancy between both groups of rural children can be accounted for by socioeconomic differences.

In his foreword to Shuey's book, Garrett explains that "inequities in the environment render it difficult to make fair comparisons between many Negro and white groups, though fair comparisons can be -- and have been -- made by a careful equating of background variables."[1] In the body of her work, however, Shuey refers to "the comparable but not equated groups of rural Negro and white children" ... in Kent County.[2] The concrete question at stake here is whether the 6.33 point difference is a socioeconomic or racial differential. While fairly sizable, nevertheless it could be accounted for by socioeconomic factors. But a possibility is not yet a disproof. It would, however, seem necessary to exert more exact controls of variables if exact findings are to be given so weighty an interpretation.

A final comment on I Q scores. Kennedy and associates' study of Negro children in the Southeast has been described in Chapter II, above, and is mentioned several times by Shuey. The mean I Q score was found to be 80.7. Shuey interprets the Kennedy finding as though I Q scores were natural objects with fixed meanings. Kennedy, on the other hand, observes: "The clinician in the field has learned that a Negro child who, in spite of the cultural deficits facing him, scores an I Q of 100 must be a superior child indeed to surmount these enormous difficulties."[3] The orientation of the Shuey book has no room for such cultural facts, for it is too concerned with the arithmetic of intelligence differences.[4]

II. The Writings of Garrett

The articles and pamphlets of Garrett are probably the most widely circulated anti-desegregation literature. Four separate publications contain his main ideas on desegregation.[1] None of these cites or discusses a single controlled study of the desegregation process. Tanser's study is reviewed as is one by McGurk.[2] Neither study involved a sample population which had been segregated and then which was desegregated. Garrett was aware, of course, of the existence of studies of environmental influences on intelligence but he disposed of them summarily: "But most of this evidence isn't evidence at all, but is wishful thinking. Therefore, it is omitted here."[3] In establishing an intelligence differential between Negro and white, Garrett cites the findings of the Kennedy study, and studies by Osborne and Project Talent. As "three examples of desegregation" he cites Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, and New York. In each case he ignored controlled studies or reports in psychological and educational journals related to desegregation in those cities.[4]

Here is a list of conclusions and observations on desegregation by Garrett:

1. "... Lowering the standards to accommodate the Negro pupil would deny the white pupil his maximum potential and would have the effect of nullifying the nationwide attempt to strengthen education at all levels."[5]

2. "The patrons of a newly-desegregated high school can look forward to lower academic performance, more dropouts, greater incidence of absenteeism,

higher costs, and fewer graduates going to college. These will occur in direct proportion to the number of Negroes enrolled. Delinquency also increases as the percentage of Negroes rises."[1]

3. "Judging the probable future from the known past, wholesale desegregation of public school will lend, first, to demoralization, next, to disorganization, and eventually to ruin or complete ineffectiveness."[2]

4. "It is painfully evident that desegregation and 'quality' education are incompatible."[3]

5. "The Federal agencies are deliberately sacrificing the country's talent in a futile attempt to accomplish the impossible: To 'equalize' the Negro child of 80 I Q with the white child of 100 I Q ."[4]

6. "Because the Negro's brain is inferior in some respects it is . . . manifestly unfair to force the Negro child to compete against white students on white standards. . . . It is equally . . . unfair to force white children to forego their opportunities for quality education in order not to embarrass the slow-learning Negro. Such educational 'breeding down' can result only in cultural and educational disaster."[5]

7. "The 'matching' studies agree that educational and sociological factors do not lessen significantly Negro-white differences in mental tests."[6]

8. " . . . It is clear that desegregation will not pull the Negro up to white standards. To the contrary, desegregation will pull down the white child. Every item of evidence points this way."[7]

9. "The greater the number of Negroes assigned to tasks beyond their ability, the greater their frustration, the greater their adverse reaction."[8]

10. "It is clear, we cannot have complete desegregation of our classrooms and first-class education."[9]

Let us examine the relation of these generalizations to the research evidence.

Garrett's first point assumes that academic standards fall when Negroes enter a heretofore white school. This stricture has no application to the controlled research studies reviewed in earlier chapters because these studies used the same I Q and achievement tests for Negro and white. When differential rates of achievement were noted, there were genuine gains and not the results of declining standards.

Points 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 contend that when Negroes desegregate a white school, the average level of achievement falls. The research evidence reviewed in Chapter II, above, contradicts this contention. Almost always the average level of achievement rises; in a very few cases, the level remains unchanged.

Points 1, 6, and 8 maintain that academic achievement of whites in desegregated schools falls either absolutely or relatively. This view is contradicted by virtually every piece of controlled research into actual classroom desegregation. See Chapter II, above.

Point 2 alleges that desegregation brings with it a decline in the number of graduates going to college. On the contrary, the Racial Isolation study showed that Negro students in desegregated schools are more likely than Negro students in segregated schools to go to college; no evidence in the same study indicated a reduction in the number of white students going to college.[1] Gordon's study of Oak Park, Michigan, High School demonstrated the increase in college-going intentions by desegregated Negro students while white students maintained the level of their college expectations; see Chapter III, above.

Points 2, 3, and 9 allege some sort of school disorganization to result from desegregation. The Racial Isolation study found student achievement in desegregated schools to thrive in the absence of interracial strife in the school. Interracial strife was not regarded as inevitable but rather within the power of school authorities to control. Gunthorpe found Negro children in a desegregated school to have a better attendance record than white students, and no worse record in truancies.[1] Alan B. Wilson found in Richmond, California that delinquency of Negro youth was strongly related to segregation, not desegregation.[2] As we saw, however, Wilson theorized that the school could counteract any tendency toward delinquency by "integrating" the lower-class student -- Negro or white -- into the activities of the school.

Point 7 is contradicted by more than one controlled study. Katzenmeyer, as we have seen, documented a highly significant narrowing of the Negro-white gap; Wolman in New Rochelle did likewise.

Point 9 raises a question that has evoked much bewonderment: If a disadvantaged child is placed in a classroom where his peers are far ahead of him, will he not become demoralized? When Katz asked rhetorically why such a child did not, in fact, become demoralized, he replied that he did not know.[3] He proceeded, however, to theorize that such a child gained an indispensable chance to measure himself more realistically and, perhaps, more mercifully. This was a step toward more effective motivation for further learning. In addition, there remains the puzzle of how really able is any student. Two previous findings are relevant: (1) Chesler and Segal's finding that half the white teachers changed their minds who had originally thought the Negro students would be unable to do as well as white students; and (2) Rosenthal's finding that student performance may be highly dependent on the teacher's expectation.

In conclusion, Garrett's writings on school desegregation must be adjudged highly insubstantial. The fundamental defect discussed here is not their viewpoint but their lack of support in the research literature.

III. The Views of C. P. Armstrong

Psychologist Armstrong has recently formulated a psychological approach against desegregation.[1] The elements of it are as follows:

1. "Mass integration will create many unhappy misfit Negro school children -- today's incipient truants and juvenile court cases, often tomorrow's criminals."[2]
2. " . . . Harm may stem from integration for many reasons including discernible, unavoidable, inevitable comparisons with whites -- even skin color itself. . . . To arouse their [Negro children's] unrealizable expectations that school desegregation will transform them into smart scholars can be psychologically devastating."[3]
3. "Rarely indeed does improved opportunity raise an I Q of a normal child irrespective of color, nor does classroom mixing of low and high I Q's improve the dull by contagion."[4]
4. "But the really serious and cruel psychological trauma to average Negro children is educational integration with younger, brighter white classmates."[5]
5. "Negro children who watch other Negro children operate ineffectively in a desegregated situation come to assess their own group as inferior."[6]
6. "Desegregated schools worsen the plight of most Negro children causing maladjustment, lasting trauma, unhappiness and delinquency."[7]
7. "Segregated schools are helpful to the average Negro child scholastically and temperamentally."[8]

Point 1 is considered by Armstrong to be of major importance, but it is essentially the same as Garrett's Point 2; see comments thereon.

Armstrong's Point 2 is close to Garrett's Point 6. An opportunity to compare may turn out to have a most constructive effect on the child's self-conception. One may recall the bright Negro girls in Singer's study who now knew they were brighter than many white children. Or, Negro youths in the Chesler-Segal study who, after desegregation, saw themselves as fully equal scholars to their white peers. Armstrong's Points 5 and 6 seem to assume that in a desegregated classroom Negroes will always turn out to be the dull ones. The research studies do not support such a supposition. When slower Negro students see brighter Negro students alongside slower white students, we can expect a more realistic self-conception as individual and as Negro.

Point 3 misses one of the most significant findings of recent social-psychological research -- the importance of the classroom peer-group for individual learning. The Berkeley and the Richmond studies by Alan B. Wilson and the findings of the Office of Education and the Commission on Civil Rights studies underscore the significance of this group factor. The process whereby this influence is communicated is far more complex than "contagion" which conjures up a picture of discrete micro-organisms flitting hither and yon. There is, as a matter of fact, a great deal about this process that the researchers still don't know. Unhappily, however, the research literature does support the proposition that desegregation may be harmful to the Negro child. As Katz indicated, a

6

prerequisite for a truly integrated school is an atmosphere of acceptance and mutual respect. In the absence of such support, desegregation may lose a good part of its favorable impact.

Armstrong's Point 7 is contradicted wholesale by the research literature of desegregation. Armstrong does not cite any cases of segregation benefiting a Negro child's scholastic performance. In Chapter II, above, we saw several instances wherein desegregation did not increase Negro achievement. But such cases were in a distinct minority. As for the temperamental benefits of segregation, again Armstrong refers to no studies or specific cases. On the other hand, the work of Blake, Haggstrom, and Singer, among others, strongly contradicts Armstrong's view.

Armstrong's perspective differs from Garrett's primarily in that it attempts more to account for the psychodynamics of desegregation. Lacking, apparently, any contact with contemporary research on desegregation, however, Armstrong is thrown back on *a priori* reasoning which does not even have the advantage of first-hand contact with current desegregation experience.

IV. Van den Haag's View

Van den Haag interprets desegregation as an impairment of the education of both white and Negro children.[1] Along with Garrett and Armstrong, he believes that whites would be held back by disadvantaged Negroes entering the classroom while the latter could not receive adequate attention in such a classroom. Several of his points follow:

1. "I am all in favor of improving the quality of education for all. But this can be done only if pupils are separated according to ability (whatever determines it). And this means very largely according to race."[1]

2. "The learning ability of Negro children on the average is not as responsive at present as that of white children to the stimulation given by average white schools. ... Desegregation is neither necessary nor sufficient to eliminate these disadvantages [of poor original environment and other possibly inherent factors]; and it would not help the average pupil of either group."[2]

3. " ... Negroes and whites should be educated separately -- unless there is evidence in specific cases that the learning of neither group suffers from congregation [desegregation] and that neither group objects."[3]

Let us examine these points.

Point 1 asserts that ability grouping is a prerequisite to improved education for all, even if it becomes largely grouping by race. The burden of a great deal of research on ability grouping is that the practice is not demonstrably beneficial or harmful for school achievement.[4] From a practical view, the elimination of ability grouping has been found beneficial in one well-known desegregation experiment -- Greenburgh District No. 8 in New York.[5] Van den Haag is contemplating what would be segregated classrooms within a desegregated school or separation by school altogether. In both cases, research evidence is relevant.

Education of Negro and white children in separate buildings has been an historic failure. Education in separate classrooms within a formally desegregated building is no better. To repeat McPartland's finding from a national sample: "Segregated classes may be more detrimental for

Negro student achievement if they occur in mostly white schools rather than mostly Negro schools."[1] The U. S. Commission on Civil Rights points out that "the root of the problem is continued academic disadvantage."[2] Thus far, academic disadvantage has not yielded to remediation within a framework of racial isolation.

Point 2 really raises the issue of whether below-average disadvantaged students can gain by desegregation. So long as we view this question from a purely individual perspective, the answer is very difficult. But the question also, or even largely, involves group perspective. As the Commission on Civil Rights found:[3]

> There is . . . a strong relationship between the attitudes and achievement of students and the social class composition of their schools. Disadvantaged students--especially Negroes--are more strongly influenced by the student environment than advantaged students. This relationship grows stronger over time. Although family and school social class factors vary in their individual importance at different grade levels, their combined influence always is great.

It would seem that the desegregating Negro student, whatever his ability and social class, stands to gain much from desegregation. Whether he will in fact do so may be more a question of school organization than level of individual ability.

Point 3 asserts the permissibility of desegregated education where it has not been demonstrably harmful to achievement. Research studies reviewed in Chapter II, above, refer to a number of such cases. A further question would seem to be in order: If these, why not others? The added requirement in Point 3 that the congregants also not object to the congregating means one thing if white students themselves are polled and another if their parents are polled.

V. Gregor Critique

A. James Gregor has criticized desegregation from another point of view.[1] It will be recalled that Gregor was the co-author of an article with C. P. Armstrong; see footnote 1, page 258, above. In his article the following statements are made:

> 1. "The evidence does, in fact, indicate that Negro children in 'integrated' situations in non-Southern standard metropolitan areas suffer in greater measure and intensity the psychodynamic impairments attributed to segregation by the liberal social scientists and consultants for the NAACP."[2]
>
> 2. " ... Negro children in 'integrated' situations suffer as many and perhaps more personality impairments as those educated in a racially homogenous environment."[3]
>
> 3. "The evidence in this respect is consistent. Under existing conditions the integration of the Negro child in the school situation places him under enormous intra-psychic tension."[4]
>
> 4. "Under conditions prevailing in the United States, the integration of non-white minority children undoubtedly generates a special kind of psychic tension to which they are not subject in racially insulated environments."[5]
>
> 5. " ... Racial separation, at least during critical periods of personality formation, may materially enhance the formation of a coherent self-system on the part of the Negro child by reducing the psychological pressure to which he is subject."[6]

> 6. "In the integration of .... the Negro radical's children into predominantly white schools he sees the initial phase of the process of self-rejection and intergroup hostility that breeds, in part, the high urban Negro delinquency and crime rate that constitutes the nucleus of the Negro stereotype, which in turn provides the necessary conditions for the next cycle of white anti-Negro bias and the ravages to be effected on the 'integrated' Negro child."[1]

Gregor identifies the Negro radical with "Negro proletarian radicalism."

Two separate issues are involved in Gregor's points: (1) Given the essentially segregative school conditions, North and South, do Negro children fare any better in norther than in southern schools? (2) Does desegregation offer the potentiality of healthier personality development of Negro children?

Gregor contends that the segregated school helps form "a coherent self system." Holland has countered this view:[2]

> Since segregation, as a component of our case organization, acts as an agent of further deprivation for the Negro child, it cannot be considered a solution to his problems of adjustment. Indeed, the imposition of segregation on a group which is aware of the etiology of this segregation in community attitudes about Negro inferiority, may engender anger and resentment, overt and covert hostility. These feelings may be internalized and lead to certain types of character formation, with impaired ego development and a burgeoning of impulses which may be acted out against society or turned against the self in the form of self-destructive behavior. The Negro child then enters adulthood unequipped academically and psychologically to make his maximum contribution to the society in which he lives.

In other words, the segregated child's self-system becomes disrupted rather than coherent. Anti-social behavior thus is expressive of segregation rather than of desegregation.

On the second issue, ample evidence testifies to the constructive personality effects of desegregation upon the Negro child. (See Chapter III, above.) Gregor's article does not cite a single study describing a situation in the process of desegregation in which harmful personality consequences for the Negro child ensued.

Children can suffer under segregation and desegregation. The weight of research evidence suggests that the harm is greater under segregation.

VI. Arendt and "Forced Integration"

While looking at a photograph of a Negro girl being pursued by a white mob as she was returning home from a newly desegregated Little Rock high school, Hannah Arendt concluded that "forced integration" was wrong.[1] She made four major points. First, if she were a Negro mother, Miss Arendt stated, "under no circumstances would I expose my child to conditions which made it appear as though it wanted to push its way into a group where it was not wanted. ... I would feel that the Supreme Court ruling, unwillingly but unavoidably, has put my child into a more humiliating position than it had been in before."[2] Better education for Negro children can be won, she continued, by fighting "for an improvement of schools for Negro children" as well as special classes for children who are to desegregate.

Second, if she were a white mother, Miss Arendt supposed, "I would agree that the government has a stake in the education of my child insofar as this child is supposed to grow up into a citizen, but I would deny that the government had any right to tell me in whose company my child received its instruction."[1] If she were a strong believer in integrated education, Miss Arendt wrote that she could organize a private, purely voluntary integrated school.

Third, she held that the most pernicious racist suffering was imposed upon Negroes by the southern practice of forbidding racial intermarriage. This deprivation was far more fundamental than school segregation. Therefore, concluded Miss Arendt, school desegregation is an evasion by white liberals of the really tough racial problem. (See Table 14.)

Table 14.

Negroes' Evaluation of Rights Most Important To Be Worked for Now[2]

(Percent Choosing Item as Most Important)

	Percent
Equal job opportunities	58
Voting rights	13
Desegregation of public schools	13
Desegregation of public places	3
No discrimination in housing	1
Can't choose one	7
No answer	5

Fourth, she observed that "the idea that one can change the world by educating the children in the spirit of the future has been one of the hallmarks of political utopias since antiquity. The trouble with this idea has always been the same: it can succeed only if the children are really separated from their parents and brought up in state institutions, or are indoctrinated in school so that they will turn against their own parents."[3]

The first point hinges on the matter of humiliation.[1] Coles, having met with numerous white and black southerners, child and adult alike, who were involved in actual desegregation, observes that Negro parents have been most reluctant to permit their children to enter white schools. Often, it is the children who initiated the process. Coles found this to be especially true in Atlanta; Chesler and Segal, in Alabama, found that the Negro parents were permissive and encouraging but did not take the initiative. Meketon's research in Kentucky, demonstrates the wholesome effect upon Negro children of a determined and successful parents' movement to force the desegregation of a school. The humiliation lies in continuing to prepare for a racial order in which "from their first years Negro children must learn who they are, where they may not go, what they most probably will be and cannot be."[2]

Tumin has replied to Miss Arendt's second point:[3]

> But doesn't Miss A., obviously a great partisan of private schools, know that parents may send their children to private schools if they wish? They don't have to send them to integrated public schools. And if they can't afford private schools? Ah, how sad indeed. For what then, one wishes to whisper, what then of Negro children and their parents and their rights? Where in the fabric of Miss A.'s minimum government do these rights get respected and protected?

Spitz comments that desegregation does not mean "forced integration," for white parents can still send their children to private schools or discriminate in other ways. "What desegregation requires," Spitz emphasized, "is that the state shall not ... prevent white and Negro students from associating with one another. ..."[4]

In stating her third point, Miss Arendt had observed that "oppressed minorities were never the best judges on the order of priorities" and thus Negroes wrongfully considered the ban on intermarriage to be less important than school desegregation. Spitz replied that "what is today possible, and what is today sought first by those who are oppressed, is not the right to be accepted as a brother-in-law, but as a brother."[1]

Miss Arendt's fourth point fails to come to terms with considerable evidence. "In a sense," Coles writes, "white and Negro children have more in common with each other than with their parents. They share a historical moment that can be painful to them regardless of race. We have seen white school children in the South suffer with shame as they slowly begin to realize what Negro classmates must endure."[2] In Chapter IV, above, we saw that white children in desegregated schools were less prejudiced than the adult white community. Tumin writes:[3]

> But every decent reporter who has visited the South and talked with school children reports that the children are far more ready and able than their parents to work side by side with Negroes, and share their common school facilities. ... What Miss A. finds to be a cruel dumping of a problem on tender children turns out to be instead a process which even segregationists recognize, and fight bitterly, namely, that school children can get on together much better than their parents, and that if their parents let them alone, they will work out ways of working and living together in the schools.

VII. Miscellaneous Commentaries

In a 1956 pamphlet, still being circulated by the Citizens Council, Sass explained his opposition to desegregation. He pointed out that "if the small children of the two races in approximately equal numbers -- as would be the case in a great many of the South's schools -- were brought together intimately and constantly and grew up in close association in integrated schools under teachers necessarily committed to the gospel of racial integration, there would be many in whom race preference would not develop."[1] One could hardly ask for a better prestatement of the conclusion reached eleven years later by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights' Racial Isolation study!

Josey states that in some situations, propinquity leads to interracial friendship; he cites examples of integrated military units, merchant seamen, and some residential developments. "On the other hand," he observes, "white children in New York who attend integrated schools are as prejudiced against Negroes as those who attend all-White schools."[2] (No specific reference is given.) In the Racial Isolation study, the very opposite was found: white students who had attended schools with Negroes for the longest time were less likely to prefer only white friends than white students who attended all-white schools.[3]

Putnam commented on at least two matters of interest. When challenged to explain the higher aspirations of Negro children, he replied: "Negroes have very high aspirations, often based on envy, but these are not matched by their performance. It is because of their high aspirational level that Negroes want the short cuts which they are unable to create themselves. The Jews, and many others, have found added motivation in hardship and persecution."[1] When asked to explain why bright Negro children whose I Q scores exceeded (overlapped) those of bright white children should not share the same classroom, Putnam answered:[2]

> ... Educability is a matter of more than I Q, and overlap in I Q does not necessarily mean overlap in other important factors. ... There is no such thing as "overlap" except in a specific quality. Educability is the learning pattern of an individual taken in totality and is made up of hundreds of traits. Overlap in all of these traits would simply mean that a child was not a Negro.

This conclusion is surely the reductio ad absurdum of racism.

VIII. Conclusions

The racist critique of desegregation is supported by a superficial interpretation of I Q score differentials by Shuey. Prominent in the critique is a stated concern for the mental health and self-coherence of the Negro child; basic to this view is an unsupported assumption that segregation is beneficial to the Negro child. Discredited allegations are repeated as to deleterious classroom consequences of desegregation in the past. In general, there is a shocking disregard and ignorance of research results. Intellectual inquiry and debate can hardly proceed under such circumstances.

FOOTNOTES

Page 248

1. See Isabella Black, "Race and Unreason: Anti-Negro Opinion in Professional and Scientific Literature Since 1954," Phylon, Spring, 1965; and I. A. Newby, Challenge to the Court. Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954-1966 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1967).

Page 249

1. Audrey M. Shuey, The Testing of Negro Intelligence, 2nd ed. (N.Y.: Social Science Press, 1966).

2. Ibid., p. 1.

3. Ibid., pp. 520-521.

4. Ibid., p. 493.

Page 250

1. Ibid., p. 120.

Page 251

1. Harry A. Tanser, The Settlement of Negroes in Kent County, Ontario, and A Study of the Mental Capacity of Their Descendants (Chatham, Ontario: Sheperd Publishers, 1939).

2. Shuey, pp. 77 and 87.

Page 252

1. Ibid., p. 101.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 68.

Page 253

1. Henry E. Garrett in ibid., p. vii.

2. Ibid., p. 68 (emphasis added).

3. Kennedy and others, The Standardization of the 1960 Revision of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro.

4. See Robert A. Hicks and Robert J. Pellegrini, "The Meaningfulness of Negro-White Differences in Intelligence Test Performance," Psychological Record, January, 1966.

Page 254

1. Henry E. Garrett, Desegregation: Fact and Hokum (Richmond, Va.: Patrick Henry Press, n.d.); "How Classroom Desegregation Works," Citizen, February, 1966; "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," Citizen, October, 1965; and How Classroom Desegregation Will Work, 5th ed. (Richmond, Va.: Patrick Henry Press, 1966). The latter two items differ only in very minor ways.

2. F. C. J. McGurk, Comparison of the Performance of Negro and White High School Seniors on Cultural and Noncultural Psychological Test Questions (Wash., D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1956).

3. Garrett, "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," p. 5.

4. See references for these cities in Meyer Weinberg (ed.), School Integration. A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967), pp. 12-13 (Wash. D.C.), 10-11 (California), and 20-26 (New York). Materials for a systematic assessment of recent public schooling in Washington, D.C. can be found in: George D. Strayer, The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949); U. S. Congress, 84th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the District of Columbia, Subcommittee to Investigate Public School Standards and Conditions and Juvenile Delinquency in the District of Columbia, Investigation of Public School Conditions (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956). Ellis O. Knox Democracy and the District of Columbia Schools. A Study of Recently Integrated Public Schools (Wash., D.C.: Judd and Detweiler, 1957); U.S. Congress, 89th, 1st and 2nd sessions, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Task Force on Antipoverty in the District of Columbia, Investigation of the Schools and Poverty in the District of Columbia. Hearings (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); Hobson v. Hansen, Congressional Record, June 21, 1967, pp. H7655-H7697; and A. Harry Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools (N.Y.: Teachers' College, Columbia University, September, 1967).

5. Garrett, How Classroom Desegregation Will Work, p. 11.

Page 255

1. Ibid., p. 13.
2. Ibid., p. 19.
3. Ibid.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 24 (emphasis in original).

7. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

9. *Ibid.*

Page 256

1. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, II, pp. 58-60 and 143-147.

Page 257

1. Gunthorpe, *A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School*, p. 108.

2. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, II, p. 201.

3. See, above, Chapter IV.

Page 258

1. Clairette P. Armstrong, *Psychodiagnosis, Prognosis, School Desegregation and Delinquency* (N.Y.: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, n.d.), reprinted from *Mankind Quarterly*, October - December, 1964; see, also, Armstrong and A. James Gregor, "Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development: Some Considerations of the Possible Effects," *Psychiatry*, February, 1964.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

8. Ibid.

Page 260

1. Ernest van den Haag, Negroes, Intelligence and Prejudice (N.Y.: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., n.d.), p. 3. (reprinted from National Review, December 1, 1964).

Page 261

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. See Jane Franseth and Rose Koury, Survey of Research on Grouping as Related to Pupil Learning (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); and Donald Vandenberg, "Ideology and Educational Policy," Journal of Educational Thought, April, 1967.

5. See Aaron Lipton: "Classroom Grouping and Integration," Integrated Education, February - March, 1964; "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," Integrated Education, June - July, 1965.

Page 262

1. McPartland, The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students, p. 4.

2. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I, p. 162.

3. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I, p. 86.

Page 263

1. A James Gregor, "Black Nationalism: A Preliminary Analysis of Negro Radicalism," Science and Society, Fall, 1963.

2. Ibid., p. 429.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 430.

6. Ibid., p. 431.

Page 264

1. Ibid., p. 432.

2. Florence N. Holland, "A Comment on the Segregated Learning Situation as an Insulating Device for the Negro Child," Psychiatry, August, 1964, p. 303.

Page 265

1. See Hannah Arendt, "Reflections on Little Rock," Dissent, Winter, 1959; "A Reply to Critics," ibid., Spring, 1959; and letter in ibid.; David Spitz, "Politics and the Realms of Being --A Reply," ibid., Winter, 1959; Melvin Tumin, "Pie in the Sky: A Reply," ibid.; letters by Sidney Hook, Dan Cooperman, Charles H. Foster, Laura H. Rhyne, and Edward E. Malkin, all in ibid., Spring, 1959; and letter by Margaret Halsey, ibid., Summer, 1959.

2. Arendt, "A Reply to Critics," p. 179.

Page 266

1. Ibid., p. 180.

2. NORC Survey SRS-160, May, 1963, in Mildred A Schwartz, Trends in White Attitudes toward Negroes (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1967), p. 6.

3. Arendt, "A Reply to Critics," p. 181.

Page 267

1. A view parallel to that of Miss Arendt's is van den Haag, "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases -- A Reply to Professor Kenneth Clark," Villanova Law Review (Fall, 1960, p. 71) "I cannot imagine that being resented and shunned personally and concretely by their white schoolmates throughout every day would be less humiliating to Negro children than a general abstract knowledge that they are separately educated because of white prejudice." Van den Haag thus characterizes the psychological consequences of segregation upon the child as mere "abstract knowledge." However, see, also, A. J. Muste: "I sometimes think that the gulf between the people who have experienced humiliation as

a people and those who have not is the deepest and most significant we have to face and that contemplation of it and awareness of its meaning is the chief essential for dealing with contemporary problems;" "The Civil Rights Movement and the American Establishment," Liberation, February, 1965, p. 10.

2. Coles, Children of Crisis, p. 321; see, also, p. 379 for an example of a mother of an early desegregation pioneer.

3. Tumin, "Pie in the Sky," p. 71.

4. Spitz, "Politics and the Realms of Being," p. 61.

Page 268

1. Ibid., p..63.

2. Coles, Children of Crisis, p. 322.

3. Tumin, "Pie in the Sky," pp. 68-69; see, also, Tumin, Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Page 269

1. Herbert Ravenel Sass, Mixed Schools and Mixed Blood (Jackson, Mississippi: Citizens Council, 1956), p. 8.

2. Charles C. Josey, An Inquiry Concerning Racial Prejudice (N.Y.: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., 1965), p. 15.

3. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, pp. 47 and 140, table 8.9; see, also, Equal Educational Opportunity, p. 333, table 3.3.5.

Page 270

1. Carleton Putnam, Race and Reality. A Search for Solutions (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967), p. 115.

2. Ibid., p. 122.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

Stated summarily, the major effects of school desegregation are as follows:

1. Academic achievement rises as the minority child learns more while the advantaged majority child continues to learn at his accustomed rate.

This finding is, for all practical purposes, established in relation to Negro children. It is less firm with regard to Indian Americans and Mexican-American children.

2. Negro aspirations, already high, are positively affected; self-esteem rises; and self-acceptance as a Negro grows.

With some exceptions, this is firmly established for Negro children; indicated for Mexican-American children; and true in an indeterminate degree for Indian-American children.

3. Toleration, respect, and occasional friendships are the chief characteristics of student and teacher relations in the desegregated school. Little informal socializing occurs outside school.

Exceptions are numerous, with physical violence playing a diminishing role.

4. While culturally different from the Negro American, the Indian Americans and Mexican Americans do not seem to respond to desegregation in any culturally unique ways.

5. The U. S. Office of Education Equal Educational Opportunity Study and the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Racial Isolation Study lend strong support to the learning and attitudinal effects of desegregation.

The latter study affords the stronger support but in no sense can the former be properly interpreted in the contrary direction.

6. The effects of desegregation on Negro Americans are evident and the support the Negro community lends to desegregation is widespread and perhaps expanding.

The movement toward black nationalism has thus far, at least, not produced a mass disillusionment with the value of desegregation.

7. Virtually none of the negative predictions by anti-desegregationists finds support in studies of actual desegregation.

The rejected predictions concerned lower achievement, aggravated self-concepts of Negro children, and growing disorder in desegregated schools.

The findings of desegregation research have not been widely circulated Even some social scientists are not acquainted with the research. Recently, for example, a leading scholarly journal printed two seriously erroneous statements about research findings:[1]

> ... Practically all the studies of the achievement of Negro pupils who have been placed in "integrated" school environments, through busing programs or school pairings, have shown, at best, insignificant results. In many cases, desegregation has been associated with a decline in the performance of Negro pupils involved.

As material in Chapter II, above, indicate, these two statements are unsupported by research.

It is therefore less surprising that political figures should be uninformed on research findings. Senator Everett M. Dirksen recently asked during Senate debate: "As a matter of reason and commonsense, what difference can it make from an educational standpoint whether an average classroom of 30 pupils is made up of all white or whether it be 15 and 15 or whether it be 20 and 10?"[1] Representative Roman Pucinski, a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, has declared that "I have never seen any evidence that either the youngsters being bused or the youngsters in host communities would benefit."[2] Notice, however, that the assertions of both political leaders are stated in problematical form, and do not positively contradict research findings. The same is not true of the quoted statements from the scholarly journal.

Several possible research trends may be indicated.

1. The scope of desegregation research will expand to deal more adequately with the Indian-American and Spanish-surname Americans.

2. The units of research analysis will be both smaller and larger: (a) the classroom rather than the school will be studied; and (b) the school system rather than the individual school will be analyzed.

3. More universities will engage in desegregation research as desegregation becomes socially acceptable.

4. School boards will become more research-permissive, if not research-minded, in response to increasing governmental requirements to demonstrate results.

5. In part because of a research emphasis on the classroom, desegregation will be more closely linked with pedagogical and instructional improvements.

6. Comparative perspectives will be employed increasingly as American desegregation problems are compared with foreign orientations to overcoming segregation and disadvantage.

7. Desegregation research will become more relevant to school practice as it is utilized by courts and administrative bodies to direct changes in educational procedures.

8. Federal executive agencies will encourage desegregation research by: (a) gathering nationwide benchmark statistics on racial aspects of schooling, and (b) expending more funds for research projects.

9. Congress will tend to be more receptive to desegregation research as research outcomes demonstrate the interdependence of educational improvement and desegregation.

10. Sociological and psychological perspectives will grow in importance in educational research to the mutual benefit of all the scholarly fields concerned.

The future of desegregation research depends, in large measure, on the future of desegregation. This may become clearer by a glance backwards. Dunbar writes:[1]

> For Americans of a generation or even a decade ago to think clearly about the Negro problem was quite impossible. I cannot recall a single commentator, no matter how gifted, who had the understanding which we have today. This is not due to our intellectual merits, but to the fact that the Negro revolt has bridged over a mass of mental sets which we could not penetrate by thought.

So, too, is it likely that the present generation has much to learn about the potential and the implementation of equal opportunity. We will learn something from events. The great danger is that old mental sets may overwhelm us. The color line is like a noose lying loosely around the neck of democratic reform. If we do not tear it away, it will tighten. In that case, all hope for educational reform will cease.

FOOTNOTES

Page 278

1. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October, 1967, p. 851.

Page 279

1. Congressional Record, December 4, 1967, p. S17827.

2. Chicago Sun-Times, January 7, 1968.

Page 280

1. Leslie W. Dunbar, A Republic of Equals (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966), pp. 6-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albert, Irene and Sheldon, Pamela. "Equality of Educational Opportunity," Educational Leadership, December, 1966.

Alsop, Joseph. "Reaction to the Coleman Report," N. E. A. Journal, September, 1967.

American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October, 1967.

Anderson, Kenneth E.; Collister, E. Gordon; and Ladd, Carl E. The Educational Achievement of Indian Children. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1953.

Anderson, Louis V. The Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement and Personality Patterns of Negro Children. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966. University Microfilm No. 66-11, 237.

Arendt, Hannah. "A Reply to Critics," Dissent, Spring, 1959.

____________. Letter in Dissent, Spring, 1959.

____________. "Reflections on Little Rock," Dissent, Winter, 1959.

Armstrong, Clairette P. Psychodiagnosis, Prognosis, School Desegregation and Delinquency. New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, n. d. Reprinted from Mankind Quarterly, October - December, 1964.

Armstrong, Clairette P. and Gregor, A. James. "Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development: Some Considerations of the Possible Effects," Psychiatry, February, 1964.

Ausubel, David P. and Pearl. "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children." (In Harry A. Passow (ed.), Education in Depressed Areas.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Baehr, Rufus F. Need Achievement and Dialect in Lower-Class Adolescent Negroes. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1964.

____________. " 'Negro Dialect' and the Motive to Achieve." Integrated Education, February - March, 1966.

Beardwood, Roger. "The New Negro Mood," *Fortune,* January, 1968.

Beker, Jerome. *A Study of Integration in Racially Imbalanced Urban Public Schools. A Demonstration and Evaluation. Final Report.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, May, 1967.

Berkowitz, Morris I. *Studies of School Desegregation and Achievement. A Summary*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Commission on Human Relations, May, 1967.

Berlin, I. N. "Desegregation Creates Problems, Too," *Saturday Review,* June 15, 1963.

Bindman, Aaron M. *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Illinois, 1965. University Microfilm No. 65-7076.

____________. "Race and Unreason: Anti-Negro Opinion in Professional and Scientific Literature Since 1954," *Phylon,* Spring, 1965.

Blake, Elias, Jr. *A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Illinois, 1960. University Microfilm No. 60-1616.

____________. *A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*. Unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. November 16-18, 1967.

Blumenfeld, Ruth. *Children of Integration.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-251.

Blumenthal, David. "Coleman Report Brings Revolution, No Solution," *Harvard Crimson,* November 28, 1967.

Boney, J. Don. "Some Dynamics of Disadvantaged Students in Learning Situations," *Journal of Negro Education,* Summer, 1967.

Boone, W. H. "Problems of Adjustment of Negro Students at a White School," *Journal of Negro Education,* October, 1942.

Bowles, Samuel and Levin, Henry M. *Equality of Educational Opportunity -- A Critical Appraisal,* 1967.

Boyd, G. F. "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXXVI, 1952.

Bradley, Gladyce. "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter, 1964.

Bradley, Nolen, Jr. *The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee*. Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966.

Brant, C. S. and Hobart, C. W. "Sociocultural Conditions and Consequences of Native Education in the Arctic: A Cross-National Comparison." Unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 18-21, 1965.

Brink, William, and Harris, Louis. *Black and White*. N.Y.: Simon Schuster, 1964.

____________. *The Negro Revolution in America*. N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1964.

Brophy, William A., and Aberle, Sophie D. (compr.). "Education," chapter 5 in *The Indian. America's Unfinished Business*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.

Brown, Bert R. *The Assessment of Self-Concept Among Four-Year-Old Negro and White Children: A Comparative Study Using the Brown-IDS Self Concept Referent Test*. New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966.

Brown, Robert G. "A Comparison of the Vocational Aspirations of Paired Sixth-Grade White and Negro Children Who Attend Segregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research*, May - June, 1965.

Brown, Rep. George E., Jr. U. S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, *Bilingual Education Hearings*, II. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Bryde, John F., S.J. *The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict*. Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770: Holy Rosary Mission, 1966.

Burkhead, Jess; Fox, Thomas G.; and Holland, John W. Input and Output in Large-City High Schools. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967.

Calderon, Judith Batista Y. A Study of Counter-Prejudice in a Mexican-Spanish Community in the Surroundings of Des Moines. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Drake University, 1948.

California State Department of Education. Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools. Part One: Distribution of Pupils, Fall, 1966. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, March 1967.

Center for Urban Education. "Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Comprehensive High School." July 31, 1967.

Cherry, Frank T. Southern In-Migrant Negroes in North Lawndale, Chicago 1949-59: A Study of Internal Migration and Adjustment. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1965.

Chesler, Mark A. Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms. Unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

Chesler, Mark A. and Segal, Phyllis. Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September, 1967.

Chicago Sun-Times, January 7, 1968.

Choldin, Harvey M. First Year in the Metropolis: A Study of Migration and Adjustment. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1965.

Clark, Edward T.; Ozenhosky, Richard J.; Barz, Anita I.; and O'Leary, John V. "Self-Concept and Vocabulary Development in Negro and White Pre-School Children," unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, April, 1967.

Clark, Kenneth B., and Clark, Mamie. "Segregation as a Factor in Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children, a Preliminary Report," Journal of Experimental Education, December, 1939.

__________. "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children," Journal of Social Psychology, November, 1939.

Clark, Kenneth B. and Plotkin, Lawrence. The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges. New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963.

Claye, Clifton M. A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro Among Secondary School Pupils in Three Schools of Arkansas. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Arkansas, 1958.

Cohen, David K. "Policy for the Public Schools," Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1968.

Coleman, James S. "Equal Schools or Equal Students?" Public Interest, Summer, 1966.

__________. Race Relations and Social Change. Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967.

__________. The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity. Unpublished paper read at a conference of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967.

__________. "Toward Open Schools," Public Interest, Fall, 1967.

Coleman, James S.; Campbell, Ernest Q.; Hobson, Carol J.; McPartland, James; Modd, Alexander M.; Weinfeld, Frederic D.; and York, Robert L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coles, Robert. Children of Crisis. A Study of Courage and Fear. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Committee on Race and Education, Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools. Portland, Oregon: Board of Education, October 29, 1964.

Congressional Record, December 4, 1967.

Coombs, L. Madison; Kron, Ralph E.; Collister, E. Gordon; and Anderson, Kenneth E. The Indian Child Goes to School. A Study of Interracial Differences. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1958.

Cooperman, Dan. Letter in *Dissent,* Spring, 1959.

Cornelius, John Scott. *The Effects of Certain Changes of Curriculum and Methods on the School Achievement of Mexican Children in a Segregated School.* Unpublished M.S. thesis in Education, University of Southern California, 1941.

Crain, Robert L. and others. *The Effects of De Facto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities.* Unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1966.

Cramer, M. Richard; Bowerman, Charles E.; and Campbell, Ernest Q. *Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents,* 2 vols., (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1966).

Criswell, Joan H. *A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom* (N.Y.: Archives of Psychology, January, 1939).

Crowley, Mary R. "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School," *Journal of Negro Education,* I (1932). A critique of this study can be found in Howard Hale Long, "Some Psychogenic Hazards of Segregated Education of Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education,* IV (1935).

De Berry, Clyde and Agger, Robert E. "School and Race in Portland," *Integrated Education,* April - May, 1965.

De Hoyos, Arturo. *Occupational and Educational Levels of Aspiration of Mexican-American Youth.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology. Michigan State University, 1961.

Dentler, Robert A. "A Basis for Classifying Ethnic Composition of Schools," *Memorandum No. 5 of the Education Complex Study.* New York: Center for Urban Education.

____________. "Equality of Educational Opportunity -- A Special Review," *Urban Review,* December, 1966.

Derbyshire, Robert L. *Personal Identity: An Attitude Study of American Negro College Students.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Maryland, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-11,093.

Deutsch, Martin and Brown, Bert. "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, April, 1964.

De Vos, George. In Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight (eds.), Caste and Race: Comparative Approaches. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Dilling, H. J. "Educational Achievement and Social Acceptance of Indian Pupils Integrated in Non-Indian Schools of Southern Ontario," Ontario Journal of Educational Research, Autumn, 1965.

Donovan, Bernard M. "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integration Education for Schools in Transitional Areas," Summary of Proposed Programs. New York: Center for Urban Education.

___________. Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-1968. Title I -- Elementary and Secondary Education Act. New York: Board of Education, August, 30, 1967.

Du Bois, William E. B. "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" Journal of Negro Education, July, 1935.

Dumbarton Research Council. Race and Education in the City of Oakland. Draft. Unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Menlo Park, California, October, 1966.

Dunbar, Leslie W. A Republic of Equals. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Dunn, Theodore F. Assumed Racial Similarily as Related to Attitudes Toward Integration. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, American University, 1958. Abstract in Dissertation Abstracts, XIX, 1959.

Dwyer, Robert J. "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, March, 1958.

Dyer, Henry S. Social Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity. Paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967.

East Harlem Projects and City Commission on Human Rights, Releasing Human Potential. A Study of East Harlem-Yorkville School Bus Transfer. New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962.

Elinson, Jack; Haberman, Paul W.; and Gell, Cyrille. Ethnic and Educational Data on Adults in New York City, 1963-1964. N.Y.: School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, Columbia University, 1967.

Elliott, Merle and Badal, Alden W. "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," California Journal of Educational Research, September, 1965.

Elshorst, Hansjorg. "Two Years After Integration: Race Relations at a Deep South University," Phylon, Spring, 1967.

Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program. Summary Report. New York: Board of Education, September, 1966.

Farmer, William A. The Influence of Segregation of Mexican and American Children Upon the Development of Social Attitudes. Unpublished M.A. thesis in Education, University of Southern California, 1937.

Feagin, Joe Richard. The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, Harvard University, March, 1966.

Ferguson, Harold A. and Plaut, Richard L. "Talent to Develop or to Lose," Educational Record, April, 1954.

Fichter, Joseph H. Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, Class of 1964. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

__________. Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Experiences and Expectations of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1965.

__________. Young Negro Talent -- Survey of the Experiences and Expectations of Negro Americans Who Graduated from College in 1961. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1964.

Folger, John K. and Nam, Charles B. Education of the American Population. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Fortenberry, James H. The Achievement of Negro Pupils in Mixed and Non-Mixed Schools. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959. University Microfilm No. 59-5492.

Foster, Charles H. Letter in Dissent, Spring, 1959.

Fox, David J. Free Choice Open Enrollment -- Elementary Schools. New York: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966.

Franseth, Jane and Koury, Rose. Survey of Research on Grouping as Related to Pupil Learning. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Frenkel, Sinai Israel. A Comparison Between Negro and White College Students on Several Personality Measures. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966.

Garrett, Henry E. Desegregation: Fact and Hokum. Richmond, Va.: Patrick Henry Press, n.d.

___________. How Classroom Desegregation Will Work, 5th ed. Richmond, Va.: Patrick Henry Press, 1966.

___________. "How Classroom Desegregation Works," Citizen, February, 1966.

___________. "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," Citizen, October, 1965.

Garth, Charles E. Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Kentucky, 1963.

Geisel, Paul N. I Q Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, Vanderbilt University, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-1838.

Ghetto Schools, Washington, D.C.: New Republic Magazine, 1967.

Gilliland, Burt E. An Evaluation of the Effect of Small Group Counseling With Negro Adolescents. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966.

Gist, Noel P. and Bennett, William S. "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," Social Forces, October, 1963.

Goldberg, Faye J. and Cowan, Gloria. "Achievement Motivation and Fantasy Production as a Function of the Race and Sex of the TAT Fitures." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, March 31, 1966.

Goldblatt, Harold S. and Tyson, Cyril. Some Self-Perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro and White Pupils in 4th, 5th and 6th Grades. (Research Report No. 12.) New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962.

Goldner, Norman S. The Mexican in the Northern Urban Area: A Comparison of Two Generations. Unpublished M. A. dissertation in Sociology, University of Minnesota, 1959.

Gordon, Edmund W. "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School, IRCD Bulletin, November, 1967.

Gordon, Edmund W. and Jablonsky. Adelaide. Compensatory Education in the Equalization of Educational Opportunity. Unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

Gordon, Edmund W. and Wilkerson, Doxey A. "Critique of Compensatory Education," in Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged. N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Gordon, Leonard. An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Wayne State University, 1966.

____________. "The Carver-Oak Park Merger," Integrated Education, June - July, 1965.

Goslin, David A. "The School in a Changing Society," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. October, 1967.

Gottlieb, David. "Goal Aspirations and Goal Fulfillments: Differences Between Deprived and Affluent American Adolescents." Unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 19, 1964.

____________. "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class. But It's Not Easy," Personnel and Guidance Journal, October, 1967.

____________. "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education. Summer, 1964.

Graves, Marian F. and Bedell, Frederick D. A Three-Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan. White Plains, New York: Board of Education, October 16, 1967.

Greenberg, Norman C. Administrative Problems Related to Integration of Navajo Indians in Public Education. Unpublished Ed. D dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963.

Greenfield, Meg. "What is Racial Balance in the Schools?" Reporter, March 23, 1967.

Gregor, A. James. "Black Nationalism: A Preliminary Analysis of Negro Radicalism," Science and Society, Fall, 1963.

Gregory, Karl D. "The Walkout: Symptom of Dying Inner City Schools," New University Thought, Spring, 1967.

Griffen, Joyce. Family Structure and School Performance: A Comparative Study of Students From Three Ethnic Backgrounds in an Integrated School. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1965. University Microfilm No. 65-13,334.

Gross, Neal; Jewell, Walter O., III; Lewis, Ralph G.; and Pederson, Eigil D. "Some Sociological Correlates of the 'Academic Productivity' of Urban Elementary Status." Unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, 1966.

Gunthorpe, Muriel G. A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School Program. Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, New York University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-8477.

Haggstrom, Warren C. "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," Integrated Education, October - November, 1963.

____________. Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-359.

Hallowell, A. Irving. Culture and Experience. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.

Halsey, Margaret. Letter in Dissent, Summer, 1959.

Hammond, Alpha J.; Sawhill, Lucy M.; and Williams, Robert B. A Survey of the Adjustment of the Negro Students Who Transferred to Schools Outside Their Neighborhoods During 1963-1964 Under the New Seattle School Board Ruling. Unpublished Master of Social Work Project, University of Washington, 1964.

Handler, June M. An Attempt to Change Kindergarten Children's Attitudes of Prejudice Toward the Negro. Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1966.

Hansen, Carl F. "The Scholastic Performances of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," Harvard Educational Review, Summer, 1960.

Hargrave, Edythe. "How I Feel as a Negro at a White College," Journal of Negro Education, October, 1942.

Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change. New York: HARYOU, 1964.

Harris, Albert J. and Lovinger, Robert J. Some Longitudinal Data on I Q Changes in the Intelligence of Negro Adolescents. New York: City University of New York, 1967.

Harwood, Edwin S. Work and Community Among Urban Newcomers: A Study of the Social and Economic Adaptation of Southern Migrants in Chicago. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1965.

Hauser, Philip M. (chairman). Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago, by the Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools. Chicago: Board of Education, March 31, 1964.

Heller, Celia S. Ambitions of Mexican-American Youth. Goals and Means of Mobility of High School Seniors. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology. Columbia University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-11,296.

Herriott, Robert E. and St. John, Nancy H. Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals. N. Y.: Wiley, 1966.

Hillson, Henry T. and Myers, Florence C. The Demonstration Guidance Project, 1957-1962. Pilot Program for Higher Horizons. New York: Board of Education, 1963.

Hobson v. Hansen, Congressional Record, June 21, 1967.

Holland, Florence N. "A Comment on the Segregated Learning Situation as an Insulating Device for the Negro Child," Psychiatry, August, 1964.

Hollister, Clifton D. Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966. University Microfilm No. 67-8277.

Hook, Sidney. Letter in Dissent, Spring, 1959.

Huson, Carolyn F. and Schiltz, Michael E. College, Color, and Employment. Racial Differentials in Postgraduate Employment Among 1964 Graduates of Louisiana Colleges. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, July, 1966.

Integrated Education, April - May, 1964.

____________. April - May, 1965.

____________. February - March, 1967.

____________. October - November, 1967.

Interuniversity Social Research Committee -- Chicago Metropolitan Area, Militancy For and Against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer, 1967. Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967.

Jencks, Christopher. "Education: The Racial Gap," New Republic, October 1, 1966.

Jerrems, Raymond L. A Sociological-Educational Study of a Public School in a Negro Lower-Class Area of a Big City. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1965.

Johnson, Norman J.; Wyer, Robert; and Gilbert, Neil. "Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study," Phylon, Fall, 1966.

Jonsson, Harold A. Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I Compensatory Activities for 1966-1967. Berkeley, California: Berkeley Unified School District, 1967.

Josey, Charles C. An Inquiry Concerning Racial Prejudice. New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., 1965.

Kaplan, Henry K. and Matkom, Anthony J. "Peer Status and Intellectual Functioning of Negro School Children," Psychology in the Schools, April, 1967.

Katz, Irwin. *Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

___________. Reply to review by Nichols in a December 9, 1966 issue of *Science, Science,* May 13, 1967.

___________. "Research on Public School Desegregation," *Integrated Education,* August - September, 1966. (A revised version of the 1966 item was published late in 1967 by the IRCD, Yeshiva University.)

___________. "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," *American Psychologist*, June, 1964.

___________. "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," 1966. To appear in the *International Journal of Psychology.*

___________. "Status of Research on School Desegregation," *IRCD Bulletin*, September, 1965.

___________. "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.* (In Press, 1967.)

Katzenmeyer, William G. *Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils.* Unpublished Ed. D dissertation, Duke University, 1962. University Microfilm No. 63-2227.

Keller, Suzanne and Zavalloni, Marisa. "Ambition and Social Class: A Respecification," *Social Forces,* October, 1964.

Kennedy, Wallace A. "A Follow-Up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement." Unpublished paper read to 1966 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Kennedy, Wallace A.; Van de Riet, V.; and White, James C. *The Standardization of the 1960 Revising of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States.* Talahassee: Human Development Clinic, Florida State University, 1961.

Kidd, J. Roby. "Education of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo," *Integrated Education,* December, 1966 - January, 1967.

King, John Randle. *An Inquiry Into the Status of Mexican Segregation in Metropolitan Bakersfield.* Unpublished M. A. thesis, Claremont Graduate School, 1946.

Krystall, Eric R.; Chesler, Mark A.; and White, Agatha E. *Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes.* Tuskegee, Alabama: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March, 1967.

Landers, Jacob. "A Letter to the Editor," *Integrated Education,* February - March, 1967.

___________. *Higher Horizons Progress Report.* New York: Board of Education, 1963.

___________. *Testimony at Public Hearing on "Education in New York City for Low Income Youngsters,"* November 16, 1967.

Lee, Frank F. *Negro and White in Connecticut Town.* N. Y.: Bookman, 1961.

Lesser, Gerald S.; Rosenthal, Kristine M.; Polkoff, Sally E.; and Pfankuch, Marjorie B. "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," *Integrated Education,* June - July, 1964.

Lipton, Aaron. "Classroom Grouping and Integration," *Integrated Education,* February - March, 1964.

___________. "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," *Integrated Education,* June - July, 1965.

Lockwood, Jane D. *An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966. University Microfilm No. 67-8303.

Logan, Rayford W. "Educational Segregation in the North," *Journal of Negro Education,* January, 1933.

Lombardi, Donald N. "Factors Affecting Change in Attitude Toward Negroes Among High School Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* Spring, 1963.

Long, Barbara and Henderson, Edmund H. "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners." Unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September, 1966.

Long, Howard H. "Test Results of Third-Grade Negro Children Selected on the Basis of Socioeconomic Status," *Journal of Negro Education*, IV (1935).

Lubera, Thaddeus J. Quoted in Helen E. Amerman, *The Impact of Inter-Group Relations on Non-Segregated Urban Public Education.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1954.

Lusienski, Dean R. *An Analysis of the Scores of Urban Negro Boys on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of Nebraska, 1964.

Maddox, James G. with Biebhafsky, E. D.; Henderson, Vivian W.; and Hamlin, Herbert M. *The Advancing South. Manpower, Prospects and Problems.* New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967.

Maliver, Bruce L. *Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Yeshiva University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-10,006.

Malkin, Edward E. Letter in *Dissent,* Spring, 1959.

Marascuilo, Leonard A. and Levin, Joel R. "Inter-and Intra-Racial Group Differences in the Perception of a Social Situation." Unpublished paper read at the February, 1966 annual meeting of the American Education Research Association.

Marx, Gary T. *Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Matzen, Stanley P. *The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms*. Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-2518.

Mayeske, George. *Educational Achievement Among Mexican Americans: A Special Report From the Educational Opportunities Survey.* Analytical Note No. 50. Washington, D. C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Office of Education, January 9, 1967.

Mayeske, George W.; Weinfeld, Frederic D.; and Beaton, Albert E., Jr. *Item Response Analyses of the Educational Opportunities Survey Teacher Questionnaire*, Analytical Note No. 59, Washington, D.C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, May 18, 1967.

Mayo, Marion Jacob. "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro," reprinted from the *Archives of Psychology*, No. 28, November, 1913.

McGurk, F. C. J. *Comparison of the Performance of Negro and White High School Seniors on Cultural and Noncultural Psychological Test Questions.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1956.

McKissick, Floyd. "Is Integration Necessary?" *New Republic*, December 2, 1966.

McPartland, James. *The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students. Interim Report.* Baltimore Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, September, 1967.

Meeks, Donald E. *Race, Social Class, and Level of Aspiration: The Effects of Race and Social Class on the Goal-Striving Behavior of White and Negro Boys.* Unpublished D.S.W. dissertation, Smith College, 1965.

Meier, Deborah. "The Coleman Report," *Integrated Education*, December, 1967.

Meketon, Betty F. *The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966.

Meyers, Edna O. "Self-Concept, Family Structure, and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys." (Abstract.) N.Y.: Northside Center for Child Development.

Monroe, Charles. "A 'Basic Program' in Junior College," *Integrated Education*, January, 1963.

Mood, Alexander M.; Spitzer, Murray; Stoller, David S.; and Weinfeld, Frederic D. "Are Better Schools Better?" *Science*, May 12, 1967.

Moore, William, Jr. A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-School Child. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, St. Louis University, 1964. University Microfilm No. 64-13,475.

Morland, J. Kenneth. "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1966.

__________. "Racial Acceptance and Preference of Nursery School Children in a Southern City," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VIII (1962).

__________. "Racial Self-Identification: A Study of Nursery School Children," American Catholic Sociological Review, Fall, 1963.

__________. "The Development of Racial Bias in Young Children," Theory Into Practice, II (1963).

__________. Token Desegregation and Beyond. New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1963.

Muste, A. J. "The Civil Rights Movement and the American Establishment," Liberation, February, 1965.

Nam, Charles B.; Rhodes, A. Lewis; and Herriott, Robert E. Inequalities in Educational Opportunities. A Demographic Analysis of Educational Differences in Population. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, May, 1966.

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. Detroit, Michigan. A Study of Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunity in a Large City. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, March, 1967.

Newby, I. A. Challenge to the Court. Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954-1966. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1967.

New York City Board of Education, Demonstration Guidance Project. Fourth Annual Progress Report, 1959-1960. New York: Board of Education, 1961.

New York Times. November 10, 1967.

Nichols, Robert C. Rejoinder to letters by Katz, Mood, and others, Science, May 12, 1967.

__________. "Schools and the Disadvantaged," Science, December 9, 1966.

Noel, Donald L. "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration." Unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Odell, William R. Educational Survey Report for the Philadelphia Board of Public Education. Philadelphia: Board of Public Education, February 1, 1965.

Pancoast, Elinor, The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools. Baltimore: Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, 1956.

Parsons, Theodore W., Jr. Ethnic Cleavage in a California School. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, Stanford University, 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-2602.

Passow, A. Harry. Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. A Profile of the Negro American. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

__________. Race and Equal Educational Opportunity, unpublished paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967.

__________ The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look. Unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Pajones, Patricia J. Social Psychological Considerations of Racially Imbalanced Schools. Published by the Massachusetts State Board of Education, April, 1965.

Powell, Christus. Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

Pratt, Philip S. *A Comparison of the School Achievement and Socio-Economic Background of Mexican and White Children in a Delta, Colorado Elementary School.* Unpublished M. A. thesis in Education, University of Southern California, 1938.

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. *The People Left Behind.* Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1967.

Putnam, Carleton. *Race and Reality. A Search for Solutions.* Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967.

Radin, Norma. *A Comparison of the Test Performance of Negro Students Attending All-Negro and Integrated Elementary Schools In One Community*. Unpublished, Ypsilanti, Michigan, Public Schools, April 15, 1966.

Rhyne, Laura H. Letter in *Dissent,* Spring, 1959.

Riese, Herta. *Heal the Hurt Child. An Approach Through Educational Therapy With Special Reference to the Extremely Deprived Negro Child.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Riessman, Frank. *Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Columbia University, 1955. University Microfilm No. 13,999.

Rivera, Ramon J.; McWorter, Gerald A.; and Lillienstein, Ernest. "Freedom Day II in Chicago," *Integrated Education*, August - September, 1964.

Rosenberg, Morris. "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," *Sociometry*, March, 1963.

___________. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Rosenthal, Robert. "Changing Children's I Q by Changing Teachers' Expectations." Unpublished paper read before the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 2, 1966.

Rubel, Arthur J. *Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1966.

___________. *Social Life of Urban Mexican-Americans*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of North Carolina, 1962.

Sain, Leonard F. *Occupational Preferences and Expectations of Negro Students Attending a High School Located in a Lower Socio-Economic Area.* Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965. University Microfilm No. 66-10,119.

Samuels, Ivan G. *Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, Indiana University, 1958. University Microfilm No. 58-2934.

Sartain, James A. *Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, Vanderbilt University, 1966.

Sass, Herbert Ravenel. *Mixed Schools and Mixed Blood.* Jackson, Mississippi, Citizens Council, 1956.

Schafer, Walter E. and Polk, Kenneth. "Delinquency and the Schools," Appendix M in the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime,* Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Schmodel, Elnora; Merrifield, Phil; and Johnson, Henry. "The Performance of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Pupils on the Minnesota Test of Creative Thinking." Unpublished paper read to the CASPP annual conference, March 20, 1964.

Schmuck, Richard and Luszki, Margaret B. *A Comparison of Negro and White Students in Several Small Midwest Communities.*

Schreiber, Daniel. In Invitational Conference on Northern School Desegregation. *Proceedings*. New York: Yeshiva University, 1962.

Schroff, Ruth. *A Study of Social Distance Between Mexican Parents and American Teachers in San Bernardino, California.* Unpublished M. A. thesis in Sociology, University of Southern California, 1936.

Schwartz, Mildred A. *Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes.* Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1967.

Scott, John C., Jr. *Race and Culture Contact in Southeastern Alaska: A Study of the Assimilation and Acculturation of the Wrangell Tlingit and White*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Chicago, 1953.

Scott, Ralph. "First to Ninth Grade I Q Changes of Northern Negro Students," *Psychology in the Schools*, April, 1966.

Seeley, David S. U. S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights, Guidelines for School Desegregation Hearings. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Sewell, William H.; Marascuilo, Leonard A.; and Pfautz, Harold W. Review Symposium on the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, American Sociological Review, June, 1967.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. "Comments on Three Cities," Integrated Education, August, 1963.

___________. Education and Income. New York: Viking, 1961.

Shuey, Audrey M. The Testing of Negro Intelligence, 2nd ed. New York: Social Science Press, 1966.

Singer, Dorothy G. Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1966.

___________. "Reading, Writing, and Race Relations," Trans-Action, June, 1967.

Smith, Ralph V.; Flory, Stanley E.; Bashshur, Rashid L.; and Shannon, Gary W. Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis. Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967.

Southern School News. October 1, 1954.

___________. July, 1956.

___________. December, 1956.

Spitz, David. "Politics and the Realms of Being -- A Reply," Dissent, Winter, 1959.

Spruill, Albert W. Consequences Encountered by Negro Teachers in the Process of Desegregation of Schools in Four Southern States. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1958. University Microfilm No. 59-1518.

St. John, Nancy H. "De Facto Segregation and Interracial Association in High School," Sociology of Education, Summer, 1964.

__________. "The Effects of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," Harvard Educational Review, Summer, 1966.

St. John, Nancy H. and Smith, Nancy. Annotated Bibliography of School Racial Mix and the Self Concept, Aspirations, Academic Achievement and Interracial Attitudes and Behavior of Negro Children. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1967.

Stallings, Frank H. "A Study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1959.

__________. Statement in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition From the Educator's Viewpoint. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Stinson, Harold N. The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963. University Microfilm No. 64-5089.

Stout, Robert and Inger, Morton. School Desegregation: Progress in Eight Cities. Unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966.

Syracuse, New York, City School District, Research Department "Study of the Effect of Integration -- Croton and Edward Smith Elementary School Pupils," U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Taba, Hilda. School Culture Studies of Participation and Leadership. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955.

Tanser, Harry A. The Settlement of Negroes in Kent County, Ontario, and A Study of the Mental Capacity of Their Descendants. Chatham, Ontario: Sheperd Publishers, 1939.

Teacher Opinion Poll. "Teaching in Center-City Schools," NEA Journal, December, 1967.

Teele, James C.; Jackson, Ellen; and Mayo, Clara. "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Hearing Held in Boston, Massachusetts, October 4-5, 1966. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Thomas, Cleveland A. "The Independent School and Desegregation," School Review, 69 (1961).

Thorndike, Robert L. Free Choice Open Enrollment -- Junior High Schools. New York: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966.

Trent, Richard D. "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, September, 1957.

Trillin, Calvin. An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes. N.Y.: Viking, 1964.

Tumin, Melvin. "Pie in the Sky: A Reply," Dissent, Winter, 1959.

Ulibarri, Horacio. Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959. University Microfilm No. 60-1261.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Conference on Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.

__________. Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

__________. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I and II. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

__________. Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint, Gatlinburg, Tennessee. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

U. S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Federal Role in Urban Affairs, Hearings, Parts 2 and 6. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U. S. Office of Education, Supplemental Appendix to the Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Vandenberg, Donald. "Ideology and Educational Policy," Journal of Educational Thought, April, 1967.

Van den Haag, Ernest. *Negroes, Intelligence and Prejudice.* New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., n.d. Reprinted from *National Review*, December 1, 1964.

___________. "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases -- A Reply to Professor Clark," *Villanova Law Review*, Fall, 1960.

Veblen, Thorstein. "The Evoluation of the Scientific Point of View," in *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays.* N.Y.: Viking, 1942.

Vredevoe, Lawrence E. "The Effects of Desegregation on School Discipline," *Education Digest*, April, 1965.

___________. "The Effort to Desegregate and Its Effects Upon School Discipline and Attitudes," *Journal of Secondary Education*, February, 1967.

Walker, Dollie; Stinchcombe, Arthur S.; and McDill, Mary S. *School Desegregation in Baltimore*. Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, August, 1967.

Wayson, William W. *Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, University of Chicago, 1966.

Webster, Staten W. *Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and its Effects upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh-Grade Pupils*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1960.

Weddington, Rachel T. *The Relative Influence of Social Class and Color on the Stereotypes of Young Children.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1958.

Weinberg, Meyer. *Report on Techniques for Achieving Racially Desegregated Superior Quality Education in the Public Schools of Chicago, Illinois*. Unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, October 23, 1967.

___________. *Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect*. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965.

__________ (ed.). *School Integration. A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References*. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967.

Weinberg, Meyer and Shabat, Oscar. *Society and Man*, second edition. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Wey, Herbert W. "Desegregation -- It Works," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 1964.

Wey, Herbert W. and Corey, John. *Action Patterns in School Desegregation.* A Guidebook. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959.

White Plains Public Schools. "Analysis of Pupil Registration by School Showing Per Cent Negro." August 30, 1967.

Wiley, Alfred D. *A Study of Desegregation in the Evansville School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, Indiana University, 1961. Summary in Dissertation Abstracts, XXII, 1962. 3477.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. and Ryan, Margaret W. (eds.). *Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Wilson, Alan B. "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," *American Sociological Review,* December, 1959.

__________. *The Effect of Residential Segregation Upon Educational Achievement and Aspirations*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1960.

Witty, Paul A. and Decker, A. I. "A Comparative Study of the Educational Attainment of Negro and White Children," *Journal of Education Psychology,* XVIII (1927).

Wolman, T. G. "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle," *Integrated Education,* December, 1964 - January, 1965.

Woods, Don. "A Brief History of Operation Exodus," *Integrated Education,* October - November, 1966.

Zinberg, Norman E. "A Group Approach With the School Teacher in the Integration Crisis," *Mental Hygiene,* April, 1967.

AUTHOR INDEX

Agger, R. E., 222, 235
Anderson, K. E., 161, 162
Anderson, L. V., 37, 140
Arendt, H., 265, 266, 267, 268
Armor, D., 202
Armstrong, C. P., 258, 259, 260, 263
Ausubel, D. P. & P., 65
Ayer, 50

Badal, A. W., 22, 23, 25
Baehr, R. F., 87
Beaton, A. F., Jr., 194
Bedell, F. D., 46, 48
Beker, J., 39, 40, 50
Bennett, W. S., 74
Berlin, I. N., 118
Bindman, A. M., 17, 18, 19, 72, 121, 133
Blake, E., 66, 67, 68, 70, 85, 91, 129, 136, 137, 147, 204, 260
Blumenfeld, R., 221
Boney, 135
Boone, W. H., 114
Bowerman, C. E., 79
Bowles, S., 192, 195, 209
Boyd, G. F., 66
Bradley, G., 120
Bradley, N., Jr., 125, 126
Brant, C. S., 164, 165
Brink, W., 229
Brown, B. R., 96, 97
Brown, R. G., 13, 76
Bryde, J. F., S. J., 166, 167, 168
Burkhead, J., 195

Calderon, J. B. Y., 169
Campbell, E. Q., 79, 186
Chesler, M. A., 82, 127, 128, 130, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 1[illegible]9, 140,
144, 224, 257, 295, 267
Choldin, H. M., 237, 240
Clark, E. T., 97
Clark, K. B., 16, 17, 118
Claye, C. M., 84, 85
Coards, H. C., 93
Coleman, J. S., 44, 65, 186, 194, 236
Coles, R., 90, 140, 267, 268

Collister, E. C., 161, 162
Coombs, L. M., 162, 163
Corey, J., 133
Cornelius, J. S., 168
Cowan, G., 79
Cramer, M. R., 79, 80
Criswell, J. H., 113
Crowley, M. R., 15

De Berry, C., 222, 235
Decker, A. I., 15
De Hoyos, A., 169, 170
Dentler, R. A., 38
Derbyshire, R. L., 87
Deutsch, M., 13
De Vos, G., 1
Dilling, H. J., 164
Dirkson, E. M., 278
Du Bois, W. E. B., 83
Dumbarton, Research Council, 22, 23, 24, 25, 88, 223
Dunbar, L. W., 280
Dunn, T. F., 115
Dwyer, R. J., 115

Elliott, M., 22, 23, 25

Farmer, W. A., 168
Feagin, J. R., 237, 238, 239
Ferguson, H. A., 11
Fichter, J. H., 81, 203
Fortenberry, J. H., 27, 28
Frenkel, S. I., 94

Garrett, H. E., 253, 254, 255, 257, 259, 260
Garth, C. E., 95, 140, 146
Geisel, P. N., 71, 72, 74, 85, 188
Gilliland, B. E., 133, 134
Gist, N. P., 79
Goldberg, F. J., 79
Goldner, N. S., 169, 170
Gordon, E. W., 139, 192, 193, 198
Gordon, L., 122, 123, 124, 125, 256
Gottlieb, D., 74, 75, 76, 131, 132, 136
Graves, M. F., 46, 48
Greenberg, N. C., 164
Gregor, A. J., 263, 264, 265

Griffen, J., 165
Gunthorpe, M. G., 31, 32, 148, 257

Haggstrom, W. C., 85, 86, 91, 116, 129, 260
Hammond, A. J., 49
Handler, J. M., 126
Harris, A. J., 13, 14
Harris, L., 229, 230
Heller, C. S., 172, 173, 174
Henderson, E. H., 94, 95
Herriott, R. E., 66, 118
Hobart, C. W., 164, 165
Holland, F. N., 264
Hollister, C. D., 236
Holmes, H., 119
Hopi, 39, 40
Hunter, C., 119
Huson, C. F., 80

Inger, M., 38, 199

Jackson, E., 50, 122
Johnson, L. B., President, 206
Johnson, N. J., 18, 19, 20, 171
Jonsson, H. A., 50, 97, 98, 121
Josey, C. C., 269

Kaplan, H. K., 126, 127, 140
Katz, I., 26, 136, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 188, 191, 194, 208, 209, 257, 259
Katzenmeyer, W. G., 28, 29, 30, 249, 250, 257
Kennedy, W. A., 12, 253, 254
King, J. R., 169
Kron, R. E., 162
Krystall, E. R., 82, 224, 225

Ladd, C. E., 161
Landers, J., 12
Lee, F. F., 117
Lesser, G. S., 31
Levin, H. M., 122, 192, 195, 209
Lillienstein, E., 221
Lipton, A., 123
Lockwood, J. D., 38, 96, 133
Logan, R. W., 65
Long, B., 94, 95

Long, H. H., 14
Lovinger, R. J., 13, 14
Lusienski, D. R., 120
Luszki, M. B., 140

Maliver, B. L., 87
Marascuilo, L. A., 122
Marx, G. T., 222, 225
Matkom, A. J., 126, 127, 140
Matzen, S. P., 33, 34, 35, 36, 44
Mayeske, G., 194
Mayo, M. J., 14, 50, 122
McDill, M. S., 40
McGurk, F. C. J., 254
McPartland, J., 43, 44, 46, 200, 201, 202, 205, 261
McWorter, G. A., 221
Meeks, D. E., 76, 77
Meketon, B. F., 88, 89, 90, 91, 140, 187, 204, 267
Merrifield, P., 171
Meyers, E. C., 141
Moore, W., Jr., 237, 238, 240
Morland, J. K., 21. 92, 93

Nam, C. B., 66
Nelson, E., Jr., 93
Nichols, R. C., 192
Noel, D. L., 98, 99

O'Connell, Daniel M., 93
Odell, W. R., 78
Osborne, 254

Parsons, T. W., Jr., 174, 175, 176, 177
Passow, A. H., 226
Pettigrew, T. F., 26, 136, 191, 199, 209, 219, 220, 223
Pfautz, 192, 193
Plaut, R. L., 11
Plotkin, C., 73
Pratt, P. S., 168
Pucinski, R., 279
Putnam, C., 269, 270

Radin, N., 37, 38
Rhodes, A. L., 66
Riessman, F., 234
Rivera, R. J., 221
Rosenberg, M., 141

Rosenthal, R., 138, 139, 257
Rubel, A. J., 171
Ryan, M. W., 114

Sain, L. F., 78
Samuels, I. G., 26, 27
Sartain, J. A., 140
Sass, H. R., 269
Sawhill, L. M., 49
Schiltz, M. E., 80
Schmodel, E., 171
Schmuck, R., 140
Schreiber, D., 13
Schroff, R., 168
Scott, J. C., Jr., 161
Scott, R., 13
Segal, P., 127, 128, 130, 134, 135, 138, 140, 144, 257, 259, 267
Sewell, W. H., 192, 193
Sexton, P. C., 195, 197
Shuey, A. M., 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 270
Singer, D. G., 90, 91, 92, 99, 129, 148, 167, 259, 260
Smith, R. V., 82, 83, 222, 237
Spiegel, J. P., 226
Spitz, D., 267, 268
Spruill, A. W., 28
Stallings, F. H., 25
Stinchcombe, A. S., 40
Stinson, H. N., 86
St. John, N. H., 79, 118
Stout, R., 38, 199

Taba, H., 171
Tanser, H. A., 251
Teele, J. C., 50, 122
Thomas, C. A., 117
Trent, R. D., 84
Tumin, M., 267

Ulibarri, H., 170

Van den Haag, E., 260, 261
Veblen, T., 7
Vredevoe, L. E., 118

Walker, D., 40, 41
Wayson, W. S., 235
Webster, S. W., 115, 116
Weddington, R. T., 84
Weinfeld, F. D., 194
Wey, H. W., 20, 133
White, A. E., 82, 224
Wilkerson, D. A., 139
Williams, R. M., Jr., 49, 114
Wilson, A. B., 68, 69, 70, 80, 191, 201, 203, 205, 206, 207, 257, 259
Witty, P. A., 15
Wolman, T. G., 32, 33, 257

York, R. L., 200, 201, 202, 205

Zinberg, N. E., 137, 138